POETRY FOR PATRONS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. W. PLEKET

C.J. RUIJGH · D.M. SCHENKEVELD · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM SEXTUM

RUURD R. NAUTA

POETRY FOR PATRONS

POETRY FOR PATRONS

LITERARY COMMUNICATION IN THE AGE OF DOMITIAN

BY

RUURD R. NAUTA

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2002

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. - Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
206. Nauta, Ruurd R.: Poetry for patrons 2002

Nauta, Ruurd R.:
Poetry for patrons : literary communication in the age of Domitian / by Ruurd R. Nauta.–Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2002
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 206)
ISBN 90-04-10885-8

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is also available.

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10885 8

© Copyright 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Für Judith

CONTENTS

Preface IX
Abbreviations XIII

Introduction: Questions and Concepts 1

PART ONE
NON-IMPERIAL PATRONAGE AND MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

Chapter One: Patronage in Martial's *Epigrams* 37
- Preliminary: "You" and "I" in Martial 39
- Asymmetry 58
- Duration 74
- Reciprocity 78
- Initiative 87

Chapter Two: Modes of Reception of Martial's *Epigrams* 91
- Oral Presentation 93
- Presentation in Writing 105
- Dedication and Publication 120
- Modes of Reception of the Published Books 131

Chapter Three: Functions of Martial's *Epigrams* 142
- Patterns of Exchange 148
- Panegyric and Carnivalisation 166

PART TWO
NON-IMPERIAL PATRONAGE AND STATIUS' *SILVAE*

Chapter Four: Patronage in Statius' *Silvae* 193
- Preliminary: Statius' Background and Career 195
- Asymmetry 204
- Duration 235
- Reciprocity 240
- Initiative 244

Chapter Five: Modes of Reception of Statius' *Silvae* 249
Oral Presentation 256
Presentation in Writing 277
Dedication and Publication 280
Chapter Six: Functions of Statius' *Silvae* 291
Apology and Advertisement 295
Praise of Quiet 308

PART THREE
IMPERIAL PATRONAGE

Chapter Seven: The Emperor as Patron 327
Community Patronage 328
Personal Patronage 335
Brokerage 341
Initiative 349
Chapter Eight: Modes of Reception of Poetry for the Emperor 356
Oral Presentation 356
Presentation in Writing 365
Dedication and Publication 374
Chapter Nine: Functions of Poetry for the Emperor 379
Interpreting Evergetism 387
Subversion or Support? 412

Appendix: The Dating of the *Epigrams* and the *Silvae* 441

Bibliography 445

Index of Passages 470
General Index 480

PREFACE

This book is a revised version of my doctoral thesis, submitted to the University of Leiden in September 1995. For a number of reasons, of which my recent appointment in the University of Groningen is one, the revision has not been as thorough as I should have wished, but I have preferred to reserve my new thoughts on some of the issues treated in this book for future articles rather than postpone publication even further. I have tried to take account of the scholarly literature that appeared since 1995, but I have not been able to use anything published after 2000.

The aim of the book is to show from an example how the concept of "patronage" may be used to achieve a better understanding of the interaction of poetry and society in ancient Rome. A "patronage relationship" is defined (after R.P. Saller) as a relationship which is personal (and therefore of some duration), asymmetrical, and reciprocal. The personal nature of the relationship allows it to be conceived of as *amicitia*, but asymmetry and reciprocity distinguish it from "friendship" in the modern sense. If the relationship of a poet with an addressee can be described as "patronage", the criterion of reciprocity must be met, which implies that the poet must be of some service to his patron. This raises the question in how far he is of service *with his poetry*, in other words what functions his poetry fulfils for his patron. That will be dependent on the audience reached, and more generally on the modes of reception of the poetry. Accordingly, the three parts of this book, on non-imperial patronage in Martial, non-imperial patronage in Statius, and imperial patronage in both, are each divided into three chapters, on patronage, on modes of reception, and on functions.

The three parts are preceded by an introduction, which uses Juvenal's seventh satire to generate the main questions to be asked, and then introduces the concepts which will be employed in trying to answer these questions. The book is conceived in such a way that after the introduction, the three parts, and also the three groups of thematically related chapters, can be read independently of each

other; frequent cross-references will remind the reader of connections with other sections.

Although the book does not eschew the more conventional kinds of classical scholarship (e.g. providing prosopograhical details for all of Statius' and Martial's patrons), its attention to reception and function entails that it also deals with less "positivistic" issues, such as the poetic "I", the role of poetry at the symposium and at the Saturnalia, the mechanics of dedication and publication, the influence of epideictic rhetoric on poetry, and the poetic representation of imperial power. These issues all concern the historical dimension of literature, and it is my hope that the book will contribute to overcome the polarisation between "historical" and "literary" approaches, and show that theoretical awareness need not be a privilege of the one or sound scholarship of the other.

In order to make the book accessible not only to Latinists, but also to students of Roman history and of literary patronage in other cultures, I have tried to reduce technical discussions and specialist bibliography to an indispensable minimum. Moreover, I have provided translations of all the Greek and Latin quoted in the main text (but not in the footnotes, where technicalities could not always be dispensed with). These translations are my own, although I have occasionally borrowed a phrase from a published version.

The book has been long (too long) in the making, and I have incurred a number of debts in the course of writing it, which it is a pleasure to acknowledge here. Among institutions, I have to thank the Fondation Hardt at Vandoeuvres near Geneva, where I could work three times three weeks in the most wonderful circumstances, and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), which not only sponsored one of my stays at the Fondation, but also enabled me to spend a year in the Fachbereich Literaturwissenschaft of the University of Constance; although the fellowship was granted for other projects, it also benefited my work on patronage. Among persons, my first thanks go to my supervisor at Leiden, P.H. Schrijvers, who has always been an unfailing source of inspiration, criticism, and encouragement. Others at Leiden who helped me in various ways include H.W. Pleket and H.S. Versnel, as well as F.P. van Oostrom, whose work on mediaeval patronage induced me to undertake a similar project in my own field. The bulk of the writing was done

when I was an *Assistent* at the Free University of Berlin, working with W.W. Ehlers; I am very grateful to him for the trust he has put in me and for his moral support in difficult times. In Berlin, Elena Merli generously shared her knowledge of Martial and provided stimulating intellectual companionship. I was also helped by invitations to lecture on various parts of the book, not only from Professors Schrijvers and Ehlers, but also from M. Citroni (Florence), K.M. Coleman (then Trinity College Dublin, now Harvard), D. den Hengst (University of Amsterdam), and N. Holzberg (Munich). I owe a further and greater debt to Professor Coleman, who not only commented in detail on my thesis, but also spontaneously corrected its English. I also received helpful comments on parts of the thesis from G.K. Galinsky (Austin) and N.M. Horsfall (Oxford). Finally, I am grateful to W.J. Dominik (Durban), who read the manuscript for the press and sent me a number of useful remarks. I want to emphasise that the text has been virtually rewritten since any of the above persons saw it, and that I claim sole responsibility for all flaws, both of form and of substance.

Groningen, November 2001

ABBREVIATIONS

Greek authors and works are abbreviated according to the system of LSJ, Latin authors and works according to that of *OLD*; for Latin authors and works not included in *OLD* readily understandable abbreviations have been chosen, preferably based on those of *ThLL*. It may be added that, unless otherwise noted, quotations from and references to Martial's *Epigrams* and Statius' *Silvae* are based on the editions of D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart 1990) and E. Courtney (Oxford 1990), respectively (but changes in capitalisation, spelling, and punctuation are not normally remarked upon).

Periodicals are abbreviated according to *L'année philologique* (cf. http://callimac.vjf.cnrs.fr:8080/AnPhilNet/TableRevues.html).

In addition, the following may be noted:

AE	*L'année épigraphique*
AL	*Anthologia Latina*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, ed. H. Temporini et al., Berlin 1972–
BMC	H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, London 1923–
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*, Cambridge 1923–
CFA	J. Scheid (ed.) *Commentarii fratrum Arualium qui supersunt*, Rome 1998
CLE	F. Bücheler and E. Lommatzsch (eds.), *Carmina Latina epigraphica*, Leipzig 1897–1982
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin 1863–
DNP	*Der neue Pauly*, Stuttgart 1996–
FPL^3	*Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*, 3rd edition ed. by J. Blänsdorf, Stuttgart and Leipzig 1995
FGE	D.L. Page (ed.), *Further Greek Epigrams*, Cambridge 1981
FO^2	L. Vidman (ed.) *Fasti Ostienses*, 2nd edition, Prague 1980

GP	A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some contemporary epigrams*, Cambridge 1968
HE	A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic epigrams*, Cambridge 1965
HLL	*Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*, ed. R. Herzog and P.L. Schmidt, Munich 1989–
I. Eph.	*Die Inschriften von Ephesos*, Bonn 1979–
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin 1873–
IGUR	L. Moretti (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, Rome 1968–1990
ILS	H. Dessau (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, Berlin 1892–1916
INapoli	E. Miranda (ed.) *Napoli*, Rome 1990–95
IRT	J.M. Reynolds and J.B. Ward-Perkins (eds.) *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, Rome 1952
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich 1981–99
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940^9
LTUR	*Lexicon topographicum Urbis Romae*, ed. E. M. Steinby, Rome 1993–2000
ML	*Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, ed. W.H. Roscher, Leipzig 1884–1937
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1982
PCG	*Poetae comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel and C. Austin, Berlin 1983–
PIR^2	*Prosopographia imperii Romani saeculi I, II, III*, 2nd edition, Berlin 1933–
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart 1941–
RE	*Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart and Munich, 1894–1980
RP	R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, Oxford 1979–91
RSt	*Roman Statutes*, ed. M.H. Crawford, London 1996
SH	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, Berlin 1983
ThLL	*Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, Leipzig 1900–

INTRODUCTION

QUESTIONS AND CONCEPTS

"Both the hope and the motive for writing lie with the emperor alone": *Et spes et ratio studiorum in Caesare tantum.* Thus Juvenal begins his seventh satire, written shortly after the accession of the emperor Hadrian in 117[1]. Although the word here translated as "writing", *studia*, covers all kinds of literary and intellectual pursuits, and although Juvenal deals with historians, orators, rhetoricians, and philologists in later sections of his satire, in the first section (until line 97) he is exclusively concerned with poets[2]. It is they who provide the illustrations to his claim that only the emperor has shown any consideration for the unhappy Muses (2–3): even famous poets have been reduced to taking up demeaning occupations (3–16), but from now on no poet will be forced to bear with a labour unworthy of his *studia* (17–19). So Juvenal encourages the young men to take up poetry, and remarks that the emperor is on the look-out for matter on which to exercise his favour (20–21). But then follows a warning: if you expect any support from any other quarter, you might just as well destroy your writing and your writing implements, for your only reward will be glory and emaciation (22–29). That is all

[1] On the date and the identity of *Caesar* I follow the *communis opinio*; cf. e.g. Rudd 1976: 84–89, Courtney 1980: 349, Braund 1988: 207–08, n. 13, Hardie 1990: 179. In the pages that follow, I have taken up the seventh satire, as the best-known text about the patronage of poets in the Early Empire, only in order to show that it confronts us with the basic questions to be discussed in this book. I do not provide an interpretation of the satire, which would demand a long and complicated engagement with the discussions esp. of Braund 1988: 24–68, 205–20, Hardie 1990, and Bartsch 1994: 125–48, 262–73.

[2] On the contents of *studia* and their importance in Roman aristocratic society in general and at the court of Hadrian in particular see Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 26–29, 78–80, 83–86. The sections in Juvenal's seventh satire probably derive from those in Suetonius' *De Viris Illustribus*, but in reversed order, the poet starting with poets, whereas the *grammaticus* had started with *grammatici*; see Townend 1973: 152, Braund 1988: 45–47, Hardie 1990: 174–77 (but P.L. Schmidt in *HLL* 4 (1997), 27–39, in accordance with older scholarship, assumes the order poets, orators, historians [and philosophers], philologists and rhetoricians).

you can hope for: *spes nulla ulterior* (30). With this phrase, Juvenal unmistakably refers back to the first line, and by so doing clinches the contrast between the emperor and the others, while at the same time announcing that the failure of those others will be the theme of what follows. Indeed, the remainder of the section is devoted to a long attack on the shabby treatment of poets, and therewith of poetry, at the hands of the Roman aristocracy.

In accordance with the programme articulated in his first satire, to confine his attacks to the dead (1.170–71), Juvenal takes his illustrations from earlier periods[3]. The past provides him not only with negative examples, but also with positive ones; the more positive the example, the further it is removed from the present day, so that the implication is one of steady decline. The high point was the Augustan age, when there were still people like Maecenas and others, who saw to it that talent received its due reward (94–97)[4]. As the classic instances of great poetry that could be written because the author had been freed from material worries, Juvenal adduces the lyric poetry of Horace (59–62) and the epic poetry of Virgil (66–71). Immediately after that, he turns to tragedy, and rhetorically asks whether we really demand the quality of the ancient stage from a poet whose tableware and cloak have been pawned by his Atreus (71–73). It is likely that the implicit contrast is with Varius, who was the author of a famous tragedy on Thyestes, in which Atreus played a dominant role, and who was regularly coupled with Virgil and Horace as the third major poet to have been supported by Maecenas[5]. So Juvenal's implicit

[3] This is not to say that the past is merely an allegory for the present. By making the correspondences neither complete nor exact, Juvenal leaves the responsibility for constructing criticisms of the present with the reader.

[4] Of the five persons listed in 94–95, four (Maecenas, Proculeius, Cotta, Fabius) are Augustan and known from Virgil, Horace, and Ovid (see Courtney 1980: 361). The fifth, Lentulus (not annotated by Courtney), is perhaps P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (*cos.* 57 B.C.E.), who promoted Cicero's return from exile.

[5] On Varius' *Thyestes* cf. Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.45 (quoting words spoken by Atreus). The conjunction of Varius with Virgil and Horace goes back to Horace himself (*S.* 1.6.54–55), is elaborated in the *Laus Pisonis* (230–42), and put into epigrammatic form by Martial: *Quod Flacco Varioque fuit summoque Maroni/ Maecenas* ... (12.3 [4].1–2). Varius also occurs as a protégé of Maecenas at Mart. 8.55 (56), a poem of which Juvenal was probably thinking in lines 67 and 69 (cf. Courtney 1980: 358–59).

picture of the golden age would comprise the three "high" genres of tragedy, epic, and lyric, and their most important representatives.

Already in the Neronian period, aristocrats no longer extended effective support (90–91). Lucan, the only Neronian poet mentioned by Juvenal, was not affected by this, because he was wealthy himself (79–80). In this respect, Lucan is contrasted with two further epic poets, Serranus and "lowly Saleius" (80–81). Serranus cannot be precisely dated[6], but Saleius figures as the paradigm of the poor poet in Tacitus' *Dialogus*, where it is reported that he received a gift of half a million sesterces from the emperor Vespasian[7]. This generosity shown to Saleius does not, of course, undermine Juvenal's point, because it came from the emperor; significantly, it is characterised in the *Dialogus* with the same quasi-technical term *indulgentia* that Juvenal uses for the favour of Hadrian (21)[8]. A more problematic case than Saleius, however, is Juvenal's next example, Statius, with whom we move to the age of Domitian.

In a famous passage (82–87), Juvenal describes the enormous popularity of Statius' recitations from his epic the *Thebaid*, but then declares that all the enthusiasm did nothing to deliver the poet from his material worries: he would have starved, had he not sold a pantomime to Paris, a dancer who was a favourite at court[9]. A few lines later follows a generalised conclusion: "What the nobles do not give, a dancer will give" (90). These statements, however trenchantly formulated, must cause surprise in any reader who is familiar with Statius' five books of *Silvae*, which contain honorific poetic compositions not only for the emperor, but also for a wide variety of Roman aristocrats. Admittedly, in these poems Statius does not mention any substantial material support, apart from a gift from the emperor (running water for his estate at Alba Longa: *Silv.* 3.1.61–64), but he

---

6 The only other mention of him is at Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.89, which allows of no chronological inference.

7 Tac. *Dial.* 5.2–3, 9.2–5, 10.2; Vespasian's gift is mentioned at 9.5. Like Serranus, Saleius occurs in Quintilian's survey of Roman epic poets: *Inst.* 10.1.90.

8 Cf. Courtney 1980: 353.

9 It has long been recognised that Juvenal uses sexual imagery to suggest that Statius prostituted his art; see esp. Tandoi 1969 and Rudd 1976: 101–05. This is only one example of Juvenal's technique of satirising those he presents as the exploited just as well as those he presents as the exploiters.

often appears in the role of a guest at the villas or town houses of his addressees, and one might surmise that these addressees granted him other favours besides hospitality. It is true that such favours would presumably be granted in exchange for poetic compliments, and thus would not be the reward of talent for its own sake that Juvenal seems to envisage[10], but the contradiction with the picture of Statius' material circumstances as painted by Juvenal would remain. Nor can the contradiction be resolved by supposing that Statius' standing with the Roman aristocracy had improved between the time of his interaction with Paris, which must have taken place before the latter's death in 83, and the composition of the *Silvae*, which fell in the years 89–96[11]: such an amelioration would be precisely what on Juvenal's account could *not* be expected. It seems better to suppose that Juvenal chose to use Statius, although he fitted his case badly, because he was the best-known of recent poets, so that his name had the richest resonance[12]. Similarly, in the categories of the rhetoricians and the philologists, Juvenal selected the most famous representatives of these professions, Quintilian (186, 188) and Remmius Palaemon (215, 219), although both were in fact well-rewarded for their efforts[13]. In any case, Juvenal's treatment of Statius does not answer, but rather poses the question of the relations that Statius established through his poetry both with the imperial court and with other members of the Roman elite.

Immediately after the passage on Statius, Juvenal continues to speak of the pantomime dancer Paris, alleging that many poets owed it to him to have been appointed to a type of military post which carried with it equestrian status (88–89); the posts in question, which

---

[10] On support of poetry for its own sake vs. support of poetry because it is of service to the patron cf. pp. 12 and 32.,

[11] Domitian had Paris murdered for allegedly having an affair with his wife, Domitia: D.C. 67.3.1 (on Paris see further Leppin 1992a: 272–75). On the dating of the *Silvae* see the Appendix.

[12] I cannot here discuss the various views to the effect that Juvenal selected ill-fitting examples in order to undermine the authority of the speaker he constructs (cf. n. 1).

[13] Quintilian' s wealth is discussed (and set aside as a-typical) by Juvenal himself at 188–203, Palaemon's wealth was known to him, if not from personal experience, then from Suet. *Gram.* 23, a passage which he seems to have had in mind (cf. Bonner 1977: 153, Hardie 1990: 176).

could apparently be held without active service, were prefectures and tribunates, so that Juvenal can summarise: "Pelopea creates prefects, Philomela tribunes" (92), Pelopea and Philomela being pantomime roles[14]. Now the only poet whom we know to have been created a tribune is Statius' contemporary, the famous epigrammatist Martial, who reports the fact himself, mentioning his equestrian status in the same breath (3.95.9–10). The suspicion may be entertained that Juvenal, after his treatment of Statius, actually included a reference to Martial, a suspicion perhaps strengthened by the existence of a glowing tribute to Paris' memory from Martial's hand (11.13)[15]. The allusion would not be quite complimentary, although Martial had been a friend of Juvenal and had published three epigrams addressed to him. But in one of those he had needed to refute rumours of a quarrel (7.24), and in another one, written after he had found his ease in Spain, he had not quite been able (or willing) to suppress his *Schadenfreude* about his friend's less fortunate fate (12.18). So a certain rancour on Juvenal's part does not seem psychologically impossible. However that may be, *if* Juvenal alludes to Martial's career, he does so in a context where he also echoes Martial's words: he contrasts the morally dubious, but effective, favours of pantomime dancers with the futility of visiting the nobility's "great halls" (*magna atria*) (91), a striking expression, borrowed from one of Martial's epigrams on a similar theme (3.38.11). This brings us to a more important (and less hypothetical) link between the seventh satire and Martial.

Like other satires by Juvenal, the seventh, and especially the section on poets, is heavily dependent on Martial for motifs and expressions; the theme itself of insufficient economic support for poets is an abiding preoccupation of the epigrammatist[16]. The dependence on

---

[14] See Courtney 1980: 360–61 (and 98).

[15] Hardie 1983: 52 speculates on a connection of Martial with Paris, but without considering the passage in Juvenal, whereas Colton 1993: 301 assumes that Juv. 7.92 is "a sneer" at Mart. 3.95.9, but without saying anything about Paris. So neither of them considers the possibility that it was Paris who gave Martial his tribunate. B.W. Jones 1996: 31–32 needlessly doubts the identity of Martial's and Juvenal's Paris.

[16] An inventory (sometimes uncritical) of Juvenal's echoes of Martial is provided by Colton 1993; see 283–302 (and 479) on 7.1–97.

Martial is most clearly marked by the use of a kind of *Leitmotiv*, which occurs immediately at the beginning of the satire and then a few times afterwards: the incongruous juxtaposition of the language of poetic inspiration (in terms of the Muses, Apollo, and Bacchus) and the language of financial transactions and material benefits (2–9, 32–37, 58–65). This comes straight from Martial, where the variations which Juvenal spreads over many lines are concentrated in one single epigram (1.76). And when Juvenal represents the world of money by the profession of auctioneer (*praeco*) (5–12), he is also following Martial, who repeatedly draws attention to the scandal that poets earn far less than auctioneers (5.56, 6.8). But, adds Juvenal, auctioneers still compare favourably to "Asian knights", who have acquired the wealth necessary for equestrian status only by delivering false testimony, and cannot hide that they were born as slaves (13–16). Again, this echoes Martial, who contrasts the "knight from Cappadocian slave-stands" with the honest, but freezing poet (10.76)[17]. And so one could continue[18]. But it is more important to notice a similarity of a structural kind[19].

Both Martial and Juvenal include themselves (or at least, their speakers) among the poets about whose fate they complain. Thus Martial, in the poem in which he contrasts the world of the Muses with the world of money, writes of "our platforms" (*pulpita nostra*: 1.76.13), i.e. the platforms from which we, the poets, give our readings[20]. The same use of the first person plural is to be observed in

[17] Martial's expression *de Cappadocis eques catastis* (10.76.3) seems to lie behind Juv. 7.15 *quamquam et Cappadoces faciant equitesque Bithyni*, whether that line is by Juvenal or (more probably: see Courtney 1980: 352) by an interpolator.

[18] Damon 1997: 188–90 sees a deliberate *contrast* with Martial in that Juvenal stresses cash, whereas Martial focuses on dining with patrons. But this is to miss both the theme of cash in Martial (cf. below, p. 81) and the food-motif in the seventh satire (*satur ... Horatius* [62], *intestina poetae* [78], *esurit* [78, *scil.* Statius]).

[19] Bartsch 1994: 135 proposes that the structure of the satire (or at least of the section on poetry) is based on Mart. 5.19, where a compliment to the emperor is followed by complaints on non-imperial patronage, as in the seventh satire. But the epigram ends with a request for imperial patronage, as Juvenal's text does not.

[20] It must be admitted that in the other poems adduced above (5.56, 6.8, 10.76), Martial does not explicitly talk about himself, but he does so on many other occasions, e.g. in the poems in which he, like Juvenal after him, idealises the support extended by Maecenas to such poets as Virgil, Horace, and Varius (to whom Martial

Juvenal, when he writes of the irremediable urge "we" feel to compose poetry, even if it leads only to frustration (48–52). Now Martial, in spite of his complaints, repeatedly acknowledges the receipt of material rewards from members of the Roman elite, including the emperor. In Juvenal there are no such acknowledgements, but he *hopes* for rewards, even if from one source only: the emperor. We may briefly consider the question what kind of support he is thinking of, in order to determine more closely the possible relevance of Martial.

Juvenal's language seems to imply that Hadrian has done something quite specific to inspire new confidence: he *has shown* consideration for the Muses (*respexit* [2]: perfect tense), and "henceforward" (*posthac*: 18) poets will receive fitting reward for their efforts. Two hypotheses have been brought forward as to what Juvenal can have in mind. Gilbert Highet proposed that Juvenal referred to Hadrian's foundation of the Athenaeum (to the beginning of the reign), and that this was an institution with "chairs and pensions for deserving writers"; Highet even suggested that Hadrian had given Juvenal "a place on the endowment of the Athenaeum"[21]. But the evidence, scanty and unreliable as it is, tells against this reconstruction. The only reference to Hadrian's act of founding the Athenaeum is a passage in the late historian Aurelius Victor, where it is called "a school of the liberal arts" (*ludus ingenuarum artium*: *Caes.* 14.3), and other sources seem to imply that this was a school of the Greek type (as the Greek name already suggests), where formal instruction in Greek literature was complemented by occasional recitations of Greek poets and rhetors; Latin seems to have been introduced only in Late Antiquity, although the possibility that it was present from the start cannot be excluded with complete certainty[22]. In any case the

---

adds the epigrammatist Domitius Marsus): 1.107, 7.29, 8.55 (56), 11.3, 12.3 (4 + 6.7–12).

[21] Highet 1954: 13–14 (with n. 17 on the date), 111–112; the quotations are from 111 and 112, respectively.

[22] The evidence has been collected and interpreted by Braunert 1964 (who is followed by Fein 1994: 296–98). Hadrian's Athenaeum is likely to have been identical with the Atrium Minervae, and this was probably an annex to the Curia; cf. Richardson 1992: 40–42, F. Zevi s.v. "Atrium Minervae", *LTUR* 1 (1993), 135–36; differently e.g. F. Coarelli s.v. "Athenaeum", *ibid.*, 131–32.

sources never refer to anything like pensions or endowments, and it is to be presumed that the only persons to be attached to the Athenaeum on a permanent basis were the teachers—and even though poets could become teachers, it is hardly likely that this was the perspective intended by Juvenal, who deals with teachers in a separate section (215–43)[23]. We know of only one case in which Hadrian did grant a pension to a poet (*qua* poet, not *qua* teacher), but that was at the Museum in Alexandria (Ath. 15.677d–e), the major cultural institution in the Greek world, which this hellenophile emperor treated which great interest and benevolence[24]. It is theoretically possible that Hadrian, of whom Aurelius Victor wrote that his foundations at Rome were undertaken "in the manner of the Greeks" (14.2), supported Latin intellectuals at Rome in the same way in which Greek intellectuals were supported at Alexandria, but we must admit that we have no evidence for this.

There is another institution, however, which has been considered as some kind of Roman equivalent to the Alexandrian Museum. This is the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, the only known temple in Rome to have been devoted (if only in part) to the Muses, the deities who gave their name to the Museum[25]. The equivalence between both institutions has been shown to be specious[26], but nevertheless Hadrian may conceivably have supported the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*, and that may conceivably have been what Juvenal was referring to in the seventh satire. Alex Hardie has adduced two passages from the seventh satire as reasons to believe that this was in-

[23] It appears from Flor. *Verg.* 3 that it was considered disgraceful for a poet to become a school teacher, at least in the Latin world. In the Greek world, the combination of both careers seems to have been more normal; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.3 and the further evidence adduced by Hardie 1983: 9. As far as the Athenaeum is concerned, it is possible that the Greek lyric poet Mesomedes, freedman and friend of Hadrian (Suda s.v. Μεσομήδης), whose *salarium* was reduced by Antoninus Pius (SHA, *Ant. Pius* 7.8), received this *salarium* for teaching at the Athenaeum (thus Steinmetz 1982: 88), but that is far from certain; cf. Fein 1994: 115–17.

[24] See briefly Millar 1992: 504–06, and more extensively Fein 1994, esp. 107–12, 114–15 on pensions for poets.

[25] The plan of the temple area (at least as it was in the time of Septimius Severus) has been preserved on fragments of the Forma Urbis, but interpretation is uncertain; cf. Richardson 1992: 187, A. Viscogliosi in *LTUR* 3 (1996), 17–19.

[26] See Horsfall 1976: 84–86 and 1991: 36–37.

deed the case: Juvenal's initial formulation that Hadrian has shown consideration to *the Muses* (*Camenas*: 2), and his description of a niggardly aristocratic benefactor as someone "to whom you pay homage after having left the temple both of the Muses and of Apollo" (*quem colis et Musarum et Apollinis aede relicta*: 37)[27]. Juvenal's meaning in the latter passage has been explained in a number of ways[28], but Hardie argues that there is a concrete reference to two temples: that of Apollo on the Palatine, which contained Rome's most important public library, and that of Hercules Musarum, which did not contain a library, but which "is known to have been used for the recitation of poetry". This statement must be somewhat qualified, because the only evidence is to be found in a third-century commentator on Horace, who may have been merely guessing—however, if he guessed, he may have guessed correctly, because a temple of the Muses is not an unlikely place for the activities of poets[29]. In any case, Hardie suggests that Hadrian supported poetic recitations in the Aedes Herculis Musarum in two ways. In the first place, Hadrian is supposed to have paid for a "permanent seating arrangement", and this is seen as the motivation for the passage in Juvenal where he insists that poets have to hire and afterwards return the benches and chairs when they recite in the houses of non-imperial benefactors (45–47). But there Juvenal is embellishing a similar description in Tacitus (*Dial.* 9.3), so that there is no need to assume that he is indirectly commenting on a new development. Secondly, and more importantly, Hadrian is supposed to have "endowed 'command performances'" in the temple and thus to have provided the material support which is Juvenal's theme. But here we have the same problem as with Highet's suggestions about the Athenaeum: pay for poetry on a fixed basis would be a novelty at Rome, and although Hadrian was an innovative person, evidence for this particular innovation is entirely lacking.

---

[27] Hardie 1990: 186–90; the following quotations are from 186 and 189 (twice).

[28] See Courtney 1980: 355.

[29] Porphyrio on Hor. *S.* 1.10.38 (whence pseudo-Acro) and on *Ep.* 2.2.94. The entire question is connected with the problem of the *collegium poetarum*, which may have met in the *Aedes Herculis Musarum*; see Horsfall as in n. 26 and White 1993: 57–58, with notes.

My criticism of both Highet and Hardie depends on the assumption that Roman emperors, at least until Hadrian, did not offer pensions or regular payment to Latin poets—and it is obviously Latin poets, not Greek ones, with whom Juvenal is concerned. This assumption of course needs to be demonstrated, and for such a demonstration an investigation of Martial, but also of Statius, is necessary, because both poets offer precious evidence: they addressed poems to the emperor, and in those poems (as well as in separate prefaces) they explicitly and implicitly discussed the kind of support the emperor granted them. The solution to the problem of Juvenal's meaning in the seventh satire may be that Hadrian's support for poets was not different from Domitian's, and that Juvenal's expression of confidence was merely a tactic of putting pressure on Hadrian to extend to others a generosity that he had already shown to some. But in order to assess this hypothesis, we need to know how and why Domitian supported Martial and Statius, among other poets.

In summary, even a brief and partial consideration of the section on poets of Juvenal's seventh satire reveals a number of perplexities which point to the need for a study of the patronage of poets in the age of Domitian. We have been brought up against the issues of Statius' relationship with his non-imperial addressees in the *Silvae*, of Martial's relationship with his non-imperial addressees in the *Epigrams*, and of the relationship of both poets (and of poets generally) with the emperor himself (and with influential persons at his court). These three issues will be the subject of the present book, in such a way that each issue will be treated in a separate part. The part on Martial will precede that on Statius, because Martial started publishing his *Epigrams* a few years earlier than Statius his *Silvae*, and the part on the emperor will be last, in order that he can be compared with the non-imperial aristocrats discussed in the two preceding parts.

But a book on literary patronage in the Age of Domitian needs some justification, because the theme has been repeatedly dealt with in recent publications, even if it is omitted from the newest work on "literary patronage in Greece and Rome"—yet omitted precisely for

the reason that it has "received ample attention elsewhere"[30]. Indeed, even a selective bibliography would easily run to some dozen titles. These would include (in chronological order): an unpublished dissertation and a number of articles by Peter White (and also his book, which, although nominally devoted to Augustan Rome, in its first part ranges over the Early Empire as a whole); Alex Hardie's monograph on the *Silvae*, which carries the word "patrons" in its sub-title; the unorthodox account of the relations between Domitian and the poets proposed by Frederic Ahl (and elaborated by John Garthwaite), as well as Kathleen Coleman's more traditional survey; two recent monographs on Martial, a small one by Niklas Holzberg and a large one by the late John Sullivan, which both contain discussions of literary patronage; and a long chapter by Mario Puelma on patronage in Martial[31]. But none of these works offers a synthesis, dealing with both non-imperial and imperial patronage of both Martial and Statius[32]. Moreover, many of the views expressed in these works, whether generalisations on larger issues of literary history, or reconstructions of specific historical circumstances, or interpretations of individual texts or passages, do not bear attentive scrutiny (as I hope to demonstrate). Most importantly, none of these works employs the conceptual framework which I think is necessary for an adequate understanding. This framework is the sociological theory of patronage, the relevance of which for the study of Roman society in the Early Empire has been demonstrated by Richard Saller[33]. A careful exposition is required, the more so since the most influential of the authors mentioned above, Peter White, has explicitly and repeatedly denied that Roman literary relations can profitably be conceived of as "patronage"[34].

[30] Gold 1987: xi; see also 9, with n. 33.

[31] White 1973a (a summary of the dissertation, which in spite of efforts I have not been able to see), 1974, 1975, 1978, 1982 (largely repeating 1978), and now 1993; Hardie 1983; Ahl 1984a and b, and Garthwaite 1978 (with subsequent publications); Coleman 1986; Holzberg 1988 (cf. already 1986); Sullivan 1991; Puelma 1995.

[32] For that one has to go back to Reure 1891 (or to the chapter on "Die schöne Literatur" in L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.191–265).

[33] See Saller 1982 (and cf. Saller 1983, Garnsey and Saller 1987: 148–56, and Saller 1989).

[34] See White 1978 and 1993: 27–34.

In English, the word "patronage", and the corresponding "patron", are used in a number of different ways, of which at least three are relevant to the present enquiry. For clarity's sake I will discuss these three usages with reference to the concrete noun "patron" rather than to the abstraction "patronage". First, the word "patron" is commonly used in the sense of "a wealthy or influential supporter of an artist or writer", the definition offered in *Webster's Third International Dictionary* and used by White[35]. Secondly, the word "patron" can be the equivalent in English of the Latin word *patronus*. And thirdly, the word "patron" is a technical term in the social sciences. It is important to disentangle these three usages when discussing the question in how far Roman poets of the Imperial Age, and specifically of the time of Domitian, had "patrons".

The associations of the word "patron" in its first usage are, according to White, "philanthropic disposition" and (when applied to a supporter of a writer rather than an artist) "literary sensibilities": the patron is assumed to take an interest in the work of the writer, and to offer him the long-term material support which will enable him to pursue that work; White then submits that this type of patron is "barely glimpsed" in the literary world of Ancient Rome[36]. Although this statement is perhaps too negative, the present study will confirm that it adequately describes the situation at least in the Domitianic period. Now one might of course propose to agree on a more flexible use of the word "patron", without the associations specified by White, but the main problem of the application of the word "patron" to the Roman situation lies elsewhere: it is not modern connotations that cause the greatest trouble, but ancient connotations.

In studies of Roman history or literature, the English word "patron" will almost inevitably evoke the Latin term *patronus*, and is indeed quite often intended as a rendering of that term. *Patronus* had a number of different, but related meanings, in one of which it was the counterpart of *cliens*, similarly Englished as "client"[37]. The institution connecting patrons and clients (in these senses) can be

[35] White 1978: 75.

[36] White 1978: 75.

[37] A survey (not always unproblematic) of the meanings of the word *patronus* through the Augustan age is provided by Neuhauser 1958.

named from both parties, as "patronage" or "clientage", whereby it is often left open in how far these words are supposed to correspond to the Latin terms *patrocinium* (or *patronatus*) and *clientela*. A further complication is that the most extensive account of the genesis and permanence of the institution is written in Greek, by the Augustan historian Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.9–11); however, it may be assumed that his terms προστάτης and πελάτης render *patronus* and *cliens* respectively. Dionysius asserts that Romulus, Rome's founder and first king, had allowed each man from the common people to choose a patron from the aristocracy, who was to protect, help, and defend him and to whom he had to offer various services in return; the relation thus established was exclusive for the client, but not for the patron—indeed the greater the number of clients, the greater the prestige of the patron—, and hereditary on both sides (2.10.4). There has long been a scholarly orthodoxy that patronage, thus understood, was of paramount importance for the political history of the Roman Republic, but this orthodoxy has now been effectively demolished[38]. However, there was another type of relationship between a *patronus* and his *clientes*, which was neither exclusive nor hereditary, and is well-attested from the Late Republic and the Early Empire. It is this type of patronage which figures largely in the epigrams of Martial and the satires of Juvenal. Both authors concur with other sources in describing how a great man at Rome was normally surrounded by a number of *clientes*, who paid him a ceremonial morning visit (the *salutatio*) and escorted and applauded him as he went about his public business; in return the clients received a gift of a small amount of money (the *sportula*) and could hope for occasional benefactions of greater substance[39]. Martial and Juvenal themselves led the life of a client[40], so that one could be tempted to suppose that the term "patronage" applies to their condition in the sense that they entertained

[38] See especially the essay "*Clientela*" in Brunt 1988: 282–442; briefly Wallace-Hadrill 1989b: 68–71.

[39] The standard accounts are Marquardt 1886: 1.200–12 and Friedländer 1919–23: 1.225–35; cf. also e.g. Marache 1961: 38–53, Rouland 1979: 507–73, Saller 1982: 119–43.

[40] For Martial this will be argued at pp. 55–58; for Juvenal, however one assesses the status of the "speakers" of and in his satires, a client life is attested by Mart. 12.18.

relations with a number of *patroni*. But this supposition would not be correct.

During the period of the Early Empire, at least until the middle of the second century, the word *patronus* is never used to refer to the great man who receives the attentions of his clients (except in narratives or statements about the past); whenever the word occurs, it refers either to the former owner of a freed slave, or to the person who defends someone else in court, or to the protector of a city, province, or other collective body, but never to the protector of an individual (outside the context of advocacy)[41]. *A fortiori* we never find that a supporter of a writer is called, either by the writer himself or by a third party, his *patronus*. The word normally used for the supporter as well as for the writer himself is *amicus*, or sometimes another word from the vocabulary of friendship such as *sodalis* or *familiaris*[42]. For that reason White has proposed that we should conceive of the people whom writers call their *amici* not as "patrons" but as "friends", and should speak not of "patronage" but of "friendship"[43]. A glance at Juvenal's seventh satire will show how problematic this would be. Juvenal there satirises an aristocrat who pretends not to have enough money to send something to his *amicus*, although he does have enough to make gifts to his mistress (who in Latin would be called his *amica*), and even to acquire a tamed lion—as if such an animal were less expensive to feed than a poet (74–78)! The poet (*poeta*: 78) is here clearly identical with the *amicus* (74), but the

---

[41] A seeming exception is Hor. *Ep*. 1.7.92, where Volteius Mena addresses Philippus, whose *cliens* he is (75), as *patrone*, but the dramatic date of the scene is in the early first century B.C.E., and *patronus* in the sense of "protector of an individual" was used until the time of Cicero: cf. Neuhauser 1958, *ThLL* 10.1.782.21–42. Saller (1982: 10–11, 1983: 255–56, 1989: 54–55) lays great stress on the circumstance that *patronus* in this sense occurs in imperial inscriptions, but if one investigates the dates of those he adduces (1982: 195–99), one finds that they all belong to the late second and the third centuries, a period which saw great transformations in titulature generally (cf. White 1993: 32).

[42] See White 1978: 80–82 and 1993: 13–14. The statement also holds for the Late Republic: see Allen 1938, Allen and DeLacy 1939, and Treggiari 1977.

[43] White 1993: 27–34. In White 1978 "patron" and "patronage" were also rejected, but there the proposal was to use the Latin terms *amicus* and *amicitia* (although the English words "friend" and "friendship" in fact regularly appeared in the text). The other authors mentioned in the previous note continue to use the vocabulary of "patronage".

treatment he receives is hardly in accordance with the modern connotations of the word "friendship". The problem is exacerbated when we realise that Juvenal, as so often, derives his motif from an epigram of Martial (9.2). There someone is addressed who is said to be "poor to *amicitia*", but not to his *amica* (1), and is reproached with spending his entire fortune on gifts with which to buy the favours of his mistress, so that nothing is left for his *amicus* (12); the relevant feature of the epigram is that Martial varies the designation of the rich man's *amicus*, also describing him as his *conuiua*, "dinner guest" (4), *sodalis*, "comrade" (8), and ... *cliens* (10). So in this context in Martial *amicus* is virtually synonymous with *cliens*, and we may conclude that in Juvenal, too, the word *amicus* describes someone who could also have been called a *cliens*.

However, the word *cliens* was often avoided, because it was felt to underscore too openly the inferiority of the one partner in the relationship to the other[44]. Instead, *amicus* was employed. Now the word *amicus* and the corresponding noun *amicitia* were used for a wide variety of relationships, whether between equals or unequals, whether marked by deeply felt affection or by mere urbane politeness, whether founded on selfless devotion or on the interested exchange of goods and services[45]. In this enumeration, the respective first alternatives corresponded to the ideal, which thus consisted in an equal, affective, and selfless relationship, but the second alternatives were often closer to the reality, and the Romans sometimes felt the need to take account of that in vocabulary as well as practice. Seneca testifies that many people organised their *salutatio* so as to have a "first" and a "second admission", and accordingly spoke of "first" and "second" *amici* (Sen. *Ben.* 6.33.4–34.2); other qualifying adjectives for the *amicus* who pays court to someone on a higher level than himself are e.g. "slight" (*tenuis*: *Laus Pis.* 118), "inferior" (*minor*: Plin. *Ep.* 2.6.2), "humble" (*modicus*: Juv. 5.108) and "cheap" (*uilis*: Juv. 5.146)[46]. Even more revealing are the depictions of the plight of the poor *amicus* in Martial and Juvenal, which are indis-

[44] Cf. Cic. *Off.* 2.69, Sen. *Ben.* 2.23.3.

[45] This was well established by Brunt 1965, repeated with slight modifications in Brunt 1988: 351–81. On Roman friendship cf. also Konstan 1997: 122–48 (from whom I differ on the semantics and pragmatics of *amicitia*).

[46] Further examples in White 1978: 81 and Saller 1982: 11–12.

tinguishable from depictions of the fate of the *cliens*; sometimes these descriptive passages crystallise into a memorable phrase, such as *sportula fecit amicos* ("the *sportula* has made them *amici*": Juv. 10.46)[47].

But *amicus* was also employed instead of the avoided term *patronus*. Again, there are qualifying adjectives which can make this meaning clear, such as "rich" (*diues*: Mart. 5.18.9), "well-off" (*felix*: Mart. 3.37.1), "powerful" (*potens*: Sen. *Brev. vit.* [*Dial.* 10].7.7, Mart. 7.72.5), and especially "great" (*magnus*: Mart. 3.41 [40].3, Juv. 1.33, 3.57, 4.20, 6.313)[48], and again there are the tableaux painted by Martial and Juvenal, with occasionally a remarkable phrase, such as Martial's characterisation of his experience at the early morning *salutatio*: *non resalutantis uideo nocturnus amicos* ("I am a nocturnal visitor of *amici* who do not return my greeting": 10.70.5)[49]. Moreover, the word *amicus* is sometimes used as the counterpart of *cliens*, as when Tacitus, in his narrative of the betrayal of the aristocrat Barea Soranus by the Stoic philosopher Egnatius Celer, calls Celer Barea's *cliens* and Barea Celer's *amicus* (*Ann.* 16.32)[50]. The word *amicus* also occurs as a synonym of *rex* ("king"), which was a current form of address for the "great friend", and is itself often a counterpart of *cliens*[51]. A good illustration is a passage

---

[47] *Amicus*: e.g. Mart. 1.99, 2.46, 2.74, 3.36, 3.46, etc., Juv. 5.32, 108, 113, 134, 146, 7.74 (discussed above), 9.62 (parallel with *cliens* at 59); *cliens*: e.g. Mart. 10.10, 10.74, 12.68, 12.77, Juv. 1.132, 3.125, 188, 5.16, 64, 9.59 (parallel with *amicus* at 62), 72.

[48] Further examples in White 1978: 81.

[49] See further e.g. Mart. 2.32, 6.50, 10.15 (14), Juv. 3. 87, 101, 107, 112, 116, 121, 5.140 ("not clearly spurious": Courtney 1980: 247), 173.

[50] The relationship between Celer and Soranus is called *amicitia* in the same context also at *Hist.* 4.10.2; Barea is Celer's *amicus* also at Juv. 3.116. Other examples of *amicus* (or *amicitia*) used as counterpart to *cliens* are Sen. *Ep.* 19.4 and Juv. 3.121–25.

[51] *Rex* as a form of address: Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.37 (Horace to Maecenas), Mart. 1.112, 2.68, 4.83, 10.10, 10.64 (*regina*), Juv. 8.161; synonymous with *amicus*: Mart. 5.19, 5.22, 10.96; counterpart of *cliens*: Sen. *Ira* 3 (*Dial.* 5).43.1, *Brev. vit.* (*Dial.* 10).3.2, Mart. 10.10, and the passage of Juvenal quoted below. Cf. further *OLD* s.v. *rex* 8 and White 1978: 81, n. 26. Damon 1997 (e.g. 16–17, 135, 173, 181) assumes that whenever *rex* is used, the patron-client relationship is characterised as parasitical, but many of the texts just mentioned do not independently show this to have been the case.

in Juvenal, on the theme of receiving a dinner invitation from a great man for whom one has performed many services (*officia*):

> Primo fige loco, quod tu discumbere iussus
> mercedem solidam ueterum capis officiorum.
> Fructus amicitiae magnae cibus: imputat hunc rex,
> et quamuis rarum tamen imputat. Ergo duos post
> si libuit menses neglectum adhibere clientem,
> tertia ne uacuo cessaret culcita lecto,
> "una simus" ait. (Juv. 5.12–18)

> The first thing to realise is this: when you are invited to recline at table, you then touch the full salary for your long-standing service. The profit gained from friendship with the great is food. This the "king" sets down as payment, (15) yes, however infrequent, he sets it down as payment. So, if after two months of neglecting his client, he deigns to invite him to dinner, just to fill up the third cushion and prevent the couch from looking empty, he says "Be my companion, please".

Juvenal speaks of *amicitia* (14), but calls the partners *rex* (14) and *cliens* (16) respectively, thus leaving no doubt about the asymmetry of the relationship. Moreover, he consistently uses a commercial vocabulary (*mercedem*, *fructus*, *imputat*), thus emphasising that the relationship is founded on material exchange. Of course it is possible to argue that the word *amicitia* stands in quotation marks, as it were: then Juvenal would want to say that either people in general or the deluded client in particular mistakenly use the word to refer to a relation that is not friendship at all[52]. It is certainly true that the theory of friendship could always be played off against its reality, and this certainly part of what Juvenal is doing here. But the theoretical sense had to be re-activated: because *amicitia* was the *only* available term to describe relationships between patrons and clients in the early Empire[53], the quotation marks had come off, even if they could always be re-introduced if a point of moral criticism was intended. But it would make little sense for moralists and satirists to deny that

[52] This is the position of e.g. LaFleur 1979 and (with focus on the deluded client) Konstan 1995: 336–38 (cf. 1997: 138–39).

[53] Konstan 1997: 137 is wrong to state (as part of an argument that *amicitia* always means "friendship") that "not *every* [his emphasis] connection between patrons and protégés is described as *amicitia*"; at least in the Early Empire, there is no alternative vocabulary.

certain relationship are *amicitia* if these relationships were not regularly regarded as such. It is significant in this respect that Martial, whenever he wishes to express that a certain patron-client relationship is *not* friendship, denies that the attitude of the partners can be described with the verb *amare*, "to love", but not that the relationship is *amicitia* or that the partners are *amici*[54]. It is therefore inadequate to use the English words "friendship" and "friend" as a rendering of *amicitia* and *amicus*: in certain cases this rendering will be correct, but in many others it will not. We need a terminology which would enable us to differentiate between the various kinds of relationships that the Romans called *amicitia*, to describe these relationships, and to give an account of the roles these relationships played in Roman society. Such a terminology is offered by the technical use of "patronage" and related terms in the social sciences.

In his book *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Richard Saller has shown that "patronage" in the sociological sense played an important part in Roman imperial society. Saller defines a "patronage relationship" with the help of "three vital elements"[55]:

> First, it involves the *reciprocal* [italics Saller] exchange of goods and services. Secondly, to distinguish it from a commercial transaction in the marketplace, the relationship must be a personal one of some duration. Thirdly, it must be asymmetrical, in the sense that the two parties are of unequal status and offer different kinds of goods and services in the exchange—a quality which sets patronage off from friendship between equals.

Saller derives his definition from one given by the social anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain, which, however, does not contain the feature that the relationship should be "personal" and "of some duration"[56]. Nevertheless, this feature is universally included in sociological and

---

[54] Mart. 2.55, 6.11, 7.76, 9.14 (where the person who not *amat* is an *amicus*); similarly Juv. 12.130, on which cf. Ehlers 1996: 67–69. Conversely, the author of the *Laus Pisonis* uses the vocabulary of *amare* to make it clear that the *amicitia* of Piso with his *clientes* is indeed true friendship (109–37).

[55] Saller 1982: 1.

[56] Boissevain 1966: 18. Boissevain has subsequently given another definition (1969: 379; cf. 1974: 147–48), which similarly does not explicitly specify this feature (although it is acknowledged in his descriptions of concrete patronage relationships).

anthropological definitions of "patronage", together with asymmetry and reciprocity[57]. Moreover, Saller's definition has been generally accepted in a recent collection of essays on patronage in ancient society, and largely coincides with the definitions used in other studies of patronage in historical societies, such as Renaissance Italy, Seventeenth-Century France and Nineteenth-Century England[58]. Therefore, I will now discuss the three elements of Saller's definition, first in more general terms and with reference to Roman society as a whole, then with reference specifically to the relationships entertained by Roman poets. But beforehand, a few remarks are in order about two further features which are also often included in definitions of "patronage".

The first is that a relationship, in order to qualify as "patronage", must be voluntary[59]. This is in fact presupposed by Saller in his decision not to study the relationship between *patronus* and freedman, because "being subject to legal regulation, it differed fundamentally from voluntary associations between freeborn men", with which he is exclusively concerned[60]. The same limitation also applies to the present study on the relationships between poet and patron. Freedman Latin poets existed in the Early Empire, as is proved by the case of Phaedrus, but they are not known from the Domitianic period, and we will have to deal with freeborn poets only[61]. Their patrons were not always "freeborn men", but could also be freedmen (and freeborn

---

[57] E.g. J.C. Scott 1972 (theoretically the richest of the many articles on patronage), esp. 124–32, Gellner 1977, Waterbury 1977: 329–332, Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 48–49 (repeated from 1980: 49–51), Nolte 1989 (summary at 11).

[58] See Wallace-Hadrill 1989a: 3, Bourne 1986: 4–8 ("reciprocity", "inequality", "intimacy"), Kettering 1986: 4 ("unequal, personal, and reciprocal"; cf.13–18, 38), Weissman 1987: 25–26. These studies (and others there cited) show that the complaint made by Finley 1983: 35, n. 25, that in patronage studies "the vast expanse of historical societies is ignored", is no longer justified.

[59] Cf. e.g. J.C. Scott 1972: 125, 131, Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 48 (= 1980: 50) under "g", Kettering 1986: 13, Wallace-Hadrill 1989a: 3.

[60] Saller 1982: vii. It would of course be possible, and could in certain circumstances be useful, to work with a less rigid concept of "patronage", which would also comprise the relationship of freedman and *patronus* (cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1989b: 76).

[61] Phaedrus' freedman addressees Eutychus (3.*prol.* and *epil.*), Particulo (4.*prol.* and *epil.*), and Philetus (5.10) were arguably his patrons, but none of them was his former master. According to the testimony of the manuscripts, Phaedrus was *libertus Augusti*.

women), but this does not affect the voluntary character of the relationships concerned.

Saller's formulation about freedmen immediately leads to the second preliminary feature: a relationship is only called "patronage" if it is not "subject to legal regulation". This is not the same as saying that it is voluntary, because the requirement is not only that the relationship should not be legally *enforced*, but also that the precise duties and obligations of the—voluntary—partners should not in any sense be legally *fixed*. To put it differently, the relationship should be "informal" or "unofficial". In practice, this may mean that patronage relationships operate in a twilight zone of questionable legitimacy, and such a way of functioning is often included in definitions or descriptions of patronage[62]. But as a matter of fact there is great variety between societies in their attitudes toward patronage, and we will see that in Roman society patronage was openly practised and freely talked about[63].

Turning now to a discussion of the three features distinguished by Saller, I begin with asymmetry. Saller equivocates about what it is that should be asymmetrical: he mentions "status" as well as the "goods and services" offered in the exchange, which is obviously not the same[64]. "Status" occasionally occurs in definitions of patronage, but normally the asymmetry of the relationship is located not in status, but in power; this would correspond to Saller's other suggestion, because power is relevant to patronage relationships to the extent that it is power to bestow "goods and services"[65]. "Status" has been called "an admirably vague word", because it is grounded neither in an objective economic position (as is "class", at least in the Marxist sense of the term) nor in an objective juridical position (as is

[62] E.g. Gellner 1977, Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 48 (= 1980: 50) under "f", Nolte 1989: 11.

[63] On this variety cf. Blok 1969 (used by Saller 1982: 4).

[64] Similarly in Garnsey and Saller 1987: 149 ("status" and the "capacity to provide superior or inferior services") and 152–53 ("status and resources").

[65] "Status": J.C. Scott 1972: 125 (but immediately below and then *passim* Scott talks of "power" and "resources"); "power": e.g. Boissevain 1966: 24 (set off from "social rank") and 1969: 379 (set off from "social status"), Gellner 1977: 4, Waterbury 1977: 329–30, Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 49 (= 1980: 50) under "i", Kettering 1986: 3, Weissman 1987: 25, 35–36.

"order"), but in the subjective opinions on social stratification prevalent in the mentality (or mentalities) of the society in question[66]. In Early Imperial Rome, status was basically correlated with wealth and political office, and because both are forms of power in the sense of control over resources, status was correlated with power, and the distinction between the two may seem to be of little practical import. However, status was also correlated with rank, in the sense of belonging to a certain order, and although rank was again correlated with wealth and political office, this second correlation was only partial. Thus some members of the "second", equestrian, order were richer than some members of the "first", senatorial, order, and some equestrian posts in the imperial administration were more important than some senatorial posts. This could lead to ambiguities in status, but these ambiguities were only small in comparison to those that could arise in the case of freedmen. We saw that Juvenal in the seventh satire was particularly indignant that Statius had to accept patronage from Paris, a freedman of the Emperor (87), and elsewhere, too, Juvenal complains that freedmen take precedence over freeborn men, even over knights and senators (1.99–116). Freedmen had the possibility of engaging in trade and commerce, and could become very wealthy by that means; imperial freedmen, moreover, could wield great political influence through their continuing contacts with their former master, the emperor. This meant that some freedmen could control great resources and on that account could act as patrons (as Paris did to Statius), even though they were of ambiguous status[67].

The resources controlled by an imperial freedman like Paris can be described with more precision if we take over a distinction, made by Saller in another context, between two types of resources and two

[66] On "class", "order", and "status" with reference to ancient society see Finley 1985: 44–51 (the quotation is from 51) and with reference specifically to Roman imperial society see Garnsey and Saller 1987: 107–25.

[67] Garnsey and Saller 1987: 120 speak of "contradictions between rank and status", apparently assuming the status of powerful freedmen to be high, K. Hopkins and G. Burton in Hopkins 1983: 181 and 184 of "incongruities" and "a dissonance" "between status and power", apparently assuming the status of powerful freedmen to be low. I propose that the conflict was between rank and power, and that, because both rank and power were determinants of status, status became ambiguous.

corresponding types of patronage. Saller again follows Boissevain, who writes:

> the resources an entrepeneur manipulates are of two distinct types, although they are very often found in combination. The first are resources, such as land, work, scholarship funds, specialised knowledge, which he controls directly. The second are strategic contacts with other people who control such resources directly or who have access to such persons. The former may be called *first order resources*, the latter *second order resources*. Persons who dispense first order resources may be called *patrons*. Those who dispense second order resources are *brokers*. [Italics Boissevain][68]

In Boissevain's usage, brokers are not patrons, but Saller rightly deviates from this in using "patron" in a comprehensive sense (as someone who dispenses resources, whether first- or second-order), so that brokers are patrons of a special kind (viz. such as dispense second-order resources). But because they do not necessarily control first-order resources, they are not necessarily of high status. This fits the situation of the imperial freedmen in Ancient Rome, whose patronage was mainly in the nature of brokerage, in that they dispensed the second-order resource of access to the emperor.

The second feature in Saller's definition of a "patronage relationship" is that of being "personal" and "of some duration". These terms are not synonymous: even though a relationship can hardly be called "personal" unless it is also "of some duration", the reverse is not true, as can be illustrated from the example of the relationship between employer and employee. The point is that that relationship is "simplex", in the sense of being limited to one type of exchange: the employee does his job, and the employer pays him his wages. In contrast, a patronage relationship is "multiplex", in the sense of covering a number of different exchanges, which are not all of an economic nature: the patron may provide his client with a job, but also defend him at law or arrange for medical help when he falls ill, while the client may swell his patron's cortège, but also spy on his enemies or entertain him at dinner; both parties may participate in important occasions in the family life of the other, such as birthdays, weddings,

---

68 Boissevain 1974: 147–48, quoted by Saller 1982: 74–75; cf. already Boissevain 1969: 380. In both contexts Boissevain expresses his debts to the work of Adrian C. Mayer.

and funerals[69]. Although the degree of intimacy and the amount of mutual affection may vary widely, it is this "whole-person" character of the relationship that allows it to be designated as "friendship", not only in Ancient Rome, but also in other societies where patronage plays an important role[70]. Although in some contexts patronage relationships may be criticised as being not true friendships, "patronage" and "friendship" are not mutually exclusive categories.

Now friendship has not only an "emotional", but also an "instrumental" side, even if the latter is often not openly acknowledged[71]. In Ancient Rome, philosophers like Cicero and Seneca argued that true friendship should be disinterested, but even they worked from the presupposition that *amicitia*, whether symmetrical or asymmetrical, is characterised by an exchange of services, which are called *officia* or *beneficia*. The right manner of conducting this exchange was discussed by Cicero in his *De Amicitia* and *De Officiis* and especially by Seneca in the seven books of his *De Beneficiis*: apparently the issue was of some concern to the Roman upper class. And if we move from theory to practice, we find in the correspondences of Cicero and Pliny abundant evidence for the importance of mutual services in *amicitia* relationships, and for the norms the partners observed or pretended to observe[72]. These norms coincide with those worked out in the philosophical treatises, and derive from one over-

---

[69] For this aspect cf. esp. J.C. Scott 1972: 126. Cf. also Eisenstadt and Roniger 1984: 48 (= 1980: 49–50), under "a" through "e".

[70] Cf. e.g. Boissevain 1966: 22 on modern Sicily, Kettering 1986: 14–15 on seventeenth-century France, Weissman 1987 on Renaissance Florence, and Lytle 1987 on the Renaissance generally.

[71] The distinction was first made by Wolf 1966: 172–73, and has since been used in characterisations of patronage as a kind of "friendship" which is not only asymmetrical, but also "instrumental", e.g. by J.C. Scott 1972: 125, 130.

[72] On the treatment of "the services of friends" both in the theoretical works and in the correspondences see Michel 1962: 502–54. On *amicitia*, *officium*, *beneficium* (and *gratia*; cf. below) in the Late Republic see also Hellegouarc'h 1972: 41–62, 152–70, 202–08, whose discussion is criticised and extended to the Early Empire by Saller 1982: 11–21. Although Sen. *Ben.* is not organised around the concept of *amicitia* (and neither is Cic. *Off.*), I cannot agree with Konstan 1995: 335 that there are only "casual references" to it before the last book; for one significant remark see 2.18.5, quoted on p. 25.

arching norm, that of reciprocity[73]. This leads to the third and final feature of "patronage" in Saller's definition.

From the very first pages of *De Beneficiis* onwards, Seneca uses the terminology of debt and credit. Thus, he explains that a *beneficium* is a very special kind of *creditum*, because the return is voluntary (1.1.3); if the giver explicitly requests the return, he thereby converts his beneficent action into an ordinary loan (1.2.3)[74]. Nevertheless, Seneca speaks of *beneficia* which have been well or ill "invested" (*collocata*: 1.1.1, *posita*: 1.2.1–2) and of the danger of "losing" *beneficia* when they are not returned (*perdere* or the passive *perire*: 1.1.1, 1.2.1–2, 1.3.1)[75]. There is a paradox here, which also occurs in other societies, and has been well characterised in the anthropological literature: "while a friend is entitled to expect a return of his feelings and favour he is not entitled to bestow them in that expectation"[76]. The receiver, on the contrary, was required to be fully conscious of his duty of reciprocity, and, although the giving of a *beneficium* was not supposed to be *credere*, the receiving of one entailed *debere* and the obligation of openly acknowledging one's *debitum*: "Those who have given, should forget about it, but the memory of those who owe (*debentium*) should be pertinacious", as Seneca puts it (1.4.5)[77].

To give one illustration, taken almost at random from Pliny's *Letters*: after Pliny has attended the recitations of many people, he decides not to recite himself, in order not to appear to have been a *creditor* rather than an *auditor* (1.13.6); but later, when he has started to recite after all, he declares it his duty to attend the recitation of his most assiduous listener, using the phrase *mutua officia*

---

73 On reciprocity in ancient society in general see Hands 1968: 26–61, on reciprocity in Early Imperial Rome in particular see Saller 1982: 12–39 and Dixon 1993.

74 At 1.2.3 the text is in doubt, but it is clear that Seneca used either a form of the verb *credere* or of the noun *creditum*. He also speaks of *feneratio*, as of *fenerari* at 1.1.9 (similarly Cic. *Fin.* 2.117 and *Amic.* 31, and already Ter. *Ph.* 493).

75 The thought and the vocabulary also occur elsewhere in Seneca (e.g. *Vit. beat.* [*Dial.* 7].24.2, *Ep.* 19.12), *collocare beneficium* also in Cicero's *De Officiis*: 1.49, 2.69 and 71 (and cf. already Enn. *scen.* 409 V.^{2} = 349 Jocelyn, quoted by Cicero at 62).

76 J. Pitt-Rivers as quoted by Saller 1982: 12, n. 20.

77 Similarly 2.10.4 and elsewhere; cf. Cic. *Amic.* 71: *officia ... meminisse debet is in quem conlata sunt, non commemorare qui contulit.*

debere (8.12.6). In both of the passages just mentioned, Pliny justifies his attitude by arguing in terms of *gratia*, which can only very approximately be translated with "thanks"[78]. In the first letter Pliny states that if he would request the return of the *officium* of listening (or of any other *officium*), the *gratia* would be lost (1.13.6). In the other letter he announces that he himself will return the same *officium* of listening, because it would be disgraceful (*turpe*) not to render *gratia* (8.12.2). This is also a central assumption in *De Beneficiis*[79], in which *gratia* is the key concept. Seneca specifies that there are two ways of being *gratus*: giving an adequate return for the benefit received, but also, if one does not have the means or the opportunity, merely entertaining the sincere desire to repay; in other words, that person is also *gratus* who owns his debt cheerfully (*qui bono animo .... debet*: 4.21.1). But the one who *has* repaid has not thereby ended his obligations to his benefactor, because the exchange has been of a personal, not of a commercial kind, and "after the repayment ... the *amicitia* remains" (2.18.5)[80]. Thus the *gratia* ethic links the reciprocity and the duration of the relationship.

Asymmetry, duration, and reciprocity are of course variables, which may be present to a higher or a lower degree[81]. Thus, the asymmetry between a senior and a junior member of the Roman aristocracy was generally smaller than that between an aristocrat and a non-aristocrat, and the relationship differed correspondingly. To take account of this, Saller speaks of "patrons and protégés" in the first case and of "patrons and clients" in the second case[82]. He thus partly reproduces the avoidance of the word *cliens* in Roman society, although he does not need to, because he uses "client" as a sociologi-

---

78 On the meanings of *gratia* and related words see Moussy 1966.

79 Cf. especially 3.1.1, where *non referre gratiam* is likewise called *turpe*. The necessity of rendering *gratia* is also articulated by Cicero in *De Officiis*: 1.47–48.

80 These thoughts, too, can be paralleled from Cicero's *De Officiis*: 2.69 (cf. already *Red. Pop.* 23—where the remark is probably interpolated—and *Planc.* 68).

81 On "variation in patron-client ties" see esp. J.C. Scott 1972: 128–32.

82 See Saller 1989: 61; also Garnsey and Saller 1987: 149–56. Garnsey and Saller take the "aristocracy" as comprising not only the senatorial and equestrian orders in their entirety, but also the order of the *decuriones*, the local town councillors (112–15). Although this makes sense sociologically (cf. also Alföldy 1984: 101–14, 124–29), it rather stretches the term "aristocracy", which I use in a more intuitive sense to refer to senators and the more wealthy or politically active among the knights.

cal term, not as the equivalent of the Roman word *cliens*. For this reason I will not attempt strict observance of Saller's terminological distinction, even if it usefully draws attention to the variation in asymmetry. As regards the personal character of the relationship, I have already indicated that it could vary from the intimacy associated with the modern concept of "friendship" to a much more distant and fugitive kind of contact. In practice ancient Romans entertained various types of relationship at the same time, which were more or less asymmetrical, more or less personalised and more or less reciprocal. But these relationships were part of one large network, through which contacts were established and resources were exchanged between the less powerful and the more powerful, up to and including the emperor. In this sense ancient Roman society can be characterised as a "patronage system"[83].

It is now possible to return to literary patronage and to formulate the hypothesis that literary patronage was part of this "patronage system". If the hypothesis is valid, we could give a technical definition of "literary patronage" which would be applicable to Ancient Rome. On this definition there would be "literary patronage" if and only if (a) the relationship between writer and supporter would be "patronage" in the technical sense, i.e. asymmetrical, personal, and reciprocal, and (b) the contribution of the writer to the exchange would consist partly in literature (we would not expect it to consist *wholly* in literature, since, as was explained above, in a personal relationship the exchange is not limited to one particular resource, but extends over various domains of the partners' lives). Such a definition is used by Saller, who adds that the contribution of the patron to the exchange must partly consist in support for the production or the distribution of the writer's texts, but that is not necessary: a writer will often receive quite unspecific benefits such as food or clothing, but there will still be "literary patronage" as long as these benefits are given (at least partly) in exchange for what the writer writes[84].

---

83 The point is made by Wallace-Hadrill 1989a: 5 and 1989b: 77; cf. Johnson and Dandeker 1989: 225–28.

84 See Saller 1983: 256–57. White 1978: 87 and 92 is wrong to conclude from the non-literary character of many of the benefits received by poets that these benefits cannot have been bestowed in exchange for poetry.

The somewhat laborious terminological qualifications necessary in English would not be called for in the other main languages of classical philology, which have a separate word for "patronage" in the sense of "support for an artist or writer", a word derived from the name of the great Roman example of such patronage: *Mäzenatentum* in German, *mécénat* in French, *mecenatismo* in Italian. In the latter language "patronage" in the sociological sense is called *clientelismo*, and in a recent collection of studies on patronage in Renaissance Italy, this distinction is used as an instrument of analysis, and the conclusion is tentatively reached that *mecenatismo* generally took the form of *clientelismo*[85]. Before we reach the same conclusion on the patronage of poets in the Age of Domitian, we must ascertain three things: that the relationship between poet and supporter was asymmetrical, that it was of a personal character and therefore of some duration, and that it was reciprocal. On each of these points a few preliminary remarks may be made.

To begin with asymmetry: in the case of exchange relationships with poets, it is of immediate consequence whether the asymmetry is grounded in status or in power. If it is grounded in status, no problem arises as long as the "patron" is of undoubtedly higher status than the poet. However, if it is grounded in power, a problem does arise even where there is a marked difference in status, because poets have their own kind of power: they command, at least potentially, the scarce resource of immortal fame. Because of this, James Zetzel has concluded an article on the patronage of poets in Ancient Rome with the statement: "It is not the poets who are the clients, but the patrons"[86]. Like much else in the article, this is too one-sided to be true[87], but it does point to a real ambiguity. By definition, the patron is less dependent on the client than the client on the patron; the dependence of the patron is on the *collectivity* of his clients, whether as voters, henchmen or entourage. But when the client is a poet, the patron is dependent on him as an *individual*. Moreover, the large number of

---

[85] See Kent and Simons (eds.) 1987, esp. the contribution by Ianziti and the introduction by Kent. In an earlier, similar collection, Lytle and Orgel (eds.) 1981, this view was not yet explored.

[86] Zetzel 1982: 101. The influence of the thought (if not of the epigrammatic formulation) is pervasive in Gold 1987.

[87] See the trenchant criticisms of Badian 1985: 349–54.

clients per patron is normally mirrored in a small number of patrons per client. But in Early Imperial Rome, just as patrons could contact many poets (of which there was a large supply[88]), poets could write for many patrons, as was indeed done by both Martial and Statius (and also by Roman poets from other periods, such as Horace). Thus a poet had significantly more power than an ordinary client and therefore a stronger position for negotiating the exchange. On the patron's side this power of the poet was sometimes implicitly acknowledged by refusing to enter into a negotiation at all and displaying the arrogant neglect about which poets like Martial and Juvenal complain so loudly. A fictional colleague of theirs, Eumolpus in Petronius' *Satyrica*, shrewdly interpreted such behaviour of the rich as resulting from a reluctance to admit that anything could compare in worth with wealth (84.1–2). But if a negotiation *was* entered upon, it could not be other than a complex act of uncertain balancing. On the one side stood the poetic resources of the poet, which—as we will see—included much more than immortality, but in so far as they did include immortality, were of uncertain value, because the future reception of the poet's works was of course unknown[89]. On the other side stood the financial and political power of the patron, but also his higher status, which of itself commanded deference. The *poet's* economic resources and social status also entered into the reckoning, and it is therefore relevant that most poets were at least of equestrian rank, so that they had some independent wealth[90]. But how much freedom this gave them has to be individually determined in each particular case.

The aspect of the poet's freedom with which Zetzel, in the article mentioned above, was mainly concerned, is the freedom to determine when and what to write. This is an issue which in the sociological terminology of patronage falls under the heading of "initiative". In some studies of patronage, it is stated that the patron normally takes

[88] See L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.214–15 (on "Dilettantismus"), 248–49 (on "Massenhaftigkeit der Gelegenheitsgedichte") and 252–58 (on "Überproduktion in der poetischen Literatur").

[89] Patrons were well aware of this, as is shown by Pliny's remarks on the poem written for him by Martial: *Ep.* 3.21, discussed at greater length at pp. 37–39, 142–145.

[90] See White 1993: 5–13, 211–22.

the initiative for all or most of the transactions which together constitute the exchange relationship[91]. But even if the greater power of the patron will often cause this to be true, the client is neither an employee nor a vassal, and therefore has a right to take the initiative himself, both in demanding and in offering a service. If we transfer this to literary patronage at Rome, we will expect to find that the initiative for the production of a literary work sometimes lay with the patron (in which case we may speak of "commission" in a loose sense[92]), sometimes with the writer. But even if the writer of his own account offered a work to his patron, he needed to consider the latter's needs and preferences. To what degree he did so again has to be individually determined in each particular case.

What we will expect *not* to find, however, is poetry written for pay, because that would not fit in with the *gratia* ethics characteristic of Roman patronage. Because the concept of *gratia* links the personal character of the relationship to its reciprocity, the following short remarks will concern both features in combination.

If the support for poets was indeed structured as patronage in the sociological sense, the remuneration for poetry must have been integrated into the pattern of the informal and unregulated exchange of gifts among "friends". When a poet offered a poem to his patron, the *gratia* ethic governing the relationship would entitle him to expect that at some time he would receive some return, but neither the time nor the return would be fixed beforehand. Indeed we do find that Roman poets never refer to direct payment for their products, even though they sometimes express hopes or disappointments about the material value of their patrons' countergifts. A seeming exception is to be found in Juvenal's picture of Statius in the seventh satire: we have seen that Juvenal depicts Statius as "selling" the libretto for a pantomime to the dancer Paris (87). But composition for the stage

---

[91] Cf. e.g. Bourne 1986: 7. Blok 1969: 365–66 (with others) *defines* the "patron" as the one who initiates the transaction, but this implies that within a given exchange relationship, either party is now patron, now client. Such a conceptualisation does not commend itself.

[92] I add "in a loose sense", because White connects the word "commission" with formal arrangements about payment (1978: 86, 1982: 52), and rightly notes that such arrangements have no place in the ideology of Roman *amicitia*. See further immediately below.

could take place on a contractual, not a personal basis (we also hear of poets making money from mimes), and Juvenal clearly regards it as a last resort for a self-respecting poet[93]. Within a patronage relationship, however, recompense for poetry could not be conceptualised as payment.

In this respect the Roman situation differs from that in other cultures, such as those of the Middle Ages, where poets did write for pay or even drew a salary from those who commissioned their works[94]. For classical philologists the most important comparison would be with Ancient Greece, but it would not be a simple one. On the one hand, Greek poets openly demanded and received fees (μισθός), on the other hand, the relationship between the poet and his paymaster was often conceptualised as some variety of patronage (ξενία, φιλία); it is significant that Theocritus in his sixteenth "idyll", a poem often adduced to illustrate the crassness of Greek poets in monetary matters, does not speak of pay or employment, but of "giving" (7, 24; cf. 17.114) and "being friends" (13), and plays on the various meanings of the word χάρις, some of which overlap with those of Latin *gratia*[95].

In general, however, there is little in Greek literature to parallel the strongly personalised poetry Romans address to their patrons. The Romans do not write in the role of a professional panegyrist, but in the role of an *amicus*. This means that their panegyrical utterances are often couched in speech acts presupposing a certain familiarity, such as congratulations, thanksgiving notes, and consolations. In other words: not only is the offering and remuneration of poetry in-

---

[93] On mimes see Ov. *Tr.* 2.507–08 (not on "librettos" as Courtney 1980: 360 has it). On the "selling" and "buying" of plays in the Archaic Age see Ter. *Eu.* 20, *Hec.* 7, 57 (and cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.175). For the Age of Augustus there is the notice, preserved in two mediaeval manuscripts (quoted e.g. by R. Helm, "Varius [21]", *RE* II.8 [1955], 410–14, at 413), that Varius received 1,000,000 HS from Augustus for his tragedy *Thyestes*, performed at the Actian Games of 29 B.C.E.

[94] See e.g. Bumke 1979.

[95] On patronage (in the non-technical sense of "support for writers") in Ancient Greece see the surveys by Hardie 1983: 15–36 (30–36 on ξενία, χάρις, and Thcr. 16), Gentili 1988: 155–76, Gold 1987: 15–38, and Bremer 1991; on ξενία and φιλία in Pindar cf. Kurke 1991. On the patronage of Greek epigrammatists by Roman aristocrats in the Late Republic and Early Empire see Cichorius 1922: 295–374. A more modern study is a desideratum.

tegrated into the gift exchange within a patronage relationship, it is also integrated into the verbal *communication* within such a relationship. This in its turn presupposes that the poetry consists in real address from poet to patron, in other words that the "I" of the poem is to be taken as the poet himself and the "you" as the patron himself. Therefore it will be one of the recurring questions in the following chapters in how far and in which way this presupposition is valid for the poetry of Martial and Statius.

But if the communication from poet to patron is to be part of an exchange relationship, it must have a positive value for the patron, in other words it must fulfil a certain function for the patron. In the case of poetry for patrons, this function is connected with the function for the audience: the poet will need to make sure that the audience appreciate the way in which the patron is represented in the poetry. In other words: the literary communication occurs not only between the poet and the patron, but also between the poet, the patron, and the audience. This implies that a functional study of literary patronage has to concern itself not only with prosopography in order to determine the patron's and the poet's positions and interests, but also with the history of mentality in order to determine how the poetry written by the poet for the patron will have been received by the audience. The relevant unit for the investigation of mentality is not in this case the population as a whole, but the *literary community*, comprising poets, patrons, and audiences, in so far as they are drawn together by literary communication[96].

The literary community to be studied in the present book is that of the Age of Domitian (81–96), which will be taken as basically synchronic, although diachronic developments within the period will not be quite neglected; moreover, the work of Martial will be considered as a whole, including the so-called *Liber Spectaculorum*, published under Titus (in 80), and Books Ten through Twelve, published under Nerva and Trajan (between 96 and 101). But with this small exception, no attempt will be made to extend the enquiry to other literary communities, let alone to give an account of the patronage of poets in the Early Empire as a whole or even in Roman history as a whole.

---

[96] On the literary community as the unit of study cf. also Nauta 1990, esp. 116–20. On the functional study of literature cf. also Nauta 1994, esp. 209–14.

Instead, one single literary community will be subjected to the questions to which the theme of patronage, as it is here conceived, gives rise. To conclude this introduction, I will briefly discuss what these questions are and how they are connected.

The initial question is, of course, the one about *patronage*: in how far may the relationships between the poets and the persons represented in their poems (usually as addressees) be described as "literary patronage" in the sense defined above? I will successively discuss asymmetry, duration, and reciprocity, and then append some consideration of initiative. As regards asymmetry, most relationships will prove to fulfil that criterion, but relationships will also be found which are not asymmetrical or which are asymmetrical in favour of the poet (e.g. relationships with slaves). The poems representing these relationships will not be quite neglected, because they are part of the total literary communication carried on by the poet, but the focus will be on relationships which do fulfil the criterion, because it is in these relationships that we are confronted with the problems of power, pressure, and politics which make the study of literary patronage interesting and important. After "asymmetry" comes "duration", which will be used as a shorthand formulation for the personal character of the relationship, because all personal relationships are of some duration, even though not all relationships of some duration are personal; this implies that it will have to be ascertained that each relationship which has been found to be of some duration is also personal. The point is particularly complicated in the case of relationships with the emperor, where special consideration has to be given to the role of brokerage. Finally, reciprocity. If we find that the relationships were indeed reciprocal, we will not have "literary patronage" in the sense of a "philanthropic" support for poetry, as demanded by White, but we will have "literary patronage" in the sense defined in this book, precisely *because* the poets offer poetry in exchange for the support they receive. This generates the question what exactly it was that the patron gave to the poet, but also the more interesting question what exactly it was that the poet gave to his patron in and through his poetry. This latter question is the one about function, but before it can be answered, another one has to be asked.

This is the question of the *modes of reception* of poetry for patrons. Because the functions a poem can fulfil for a patron are dependent on the effects it has on its audience, we need to try to iden-

tify this audience and to determine under what conditions it receives (i.e. hears or reads) the poem. Two levels have to be distinguished: that of occasionality and that of publication. It will be argued that some poems were originally meant to function only at the level of occasionality, i.e. to have only a single reception on a certain specific occasion, whereas other poems were meant to function at the level of publication, i.e. to be made available for an indefinite number of receptions through the medium of the published book; many poems were meant to function first at the one, and subsequently at the other level[97]. If a poem was presented on an occasion, this could be done either orally or in writing. If it was presented orally (i.e. recited and perhaps even improvised), we need to determine, if possible, what the occasion was and which persons were present. If the poem was presented in writing, we have to assume that it was primarily meant for reading by the patron himself, unless we have evidence for further intended receptions. As will be seen, presentation in writing cannot be strictly separated from "dedication" and "publication", and it will be necessary to consider how these words can be meaningfully used in the context of ancient Roman society, in which the printing press was (of course) unknown. When a book was published, its audience was unlimited in principle, but not in practice, and we have to try to identify the audience that was actually reached. This cannot generally be done with any precision, but we are fortunate in the circumstance that of all ancient authors, none gives more information on the receptions of his published books than Martial, so that in his case (if not in that of Statius) it is possible to get at least an approximate idea of his "readership" in the Roman world.

Only after the question of reception has been dealt with, can the third main question be tackled, that of the functions of poetry for patrons. To give one example: if it is indeed true that some poems were originally intended for reception on a single occasion, then the function of these poems for their patrons cannot have been to provide immortal fame. So the exchange of support for immortality, which I used to illustrate the potential instability of the asymmetry in the

---

[97] Although I have tried to avoid both the plural form *receptions* and the verb *to receive* in the technical sense of German *Rezeptionen* and *rezipieren*, this has not always been possible.

relationship between poet and patron, is a much too simplistic model. In reality there is a wide variety of functions, but these can only be discovered through careful interpretations, which will need to consider not only the historical context of each poem, but also the outcome of the investigations on the relationship between the poet and the patron and on the reception of the poem by its audience.

These three questions, on patronage, on modes of reception, and on functions, will each receive a chapter in each of the three parts, on non-imperial patronage and Martial, on non-imperial patronage and Statius, and on imperial patronage. Thus the book has a structure of three times three chapters, in such a way that it can be read both "vertically" and "horizontally": vertically by reading the three parts (chs. 1–3, 4–6, 7–9), horizontally by reading the three groups of chapters corresponding to the three main questions (chs. 1–4–7, 2–5–8, 3–6–9).

PART ONE

NON-IMPERIAL PATRONAGE AND MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

CHAPTER ONE

PATRONAGE IN MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

The evidence for Martial's relations with his patrons is to be found almost exclusively in the *Epigrams* themselves. The major exception is a letter written by Pliny the Younger around 103, on hearing the news of Martial's death (*Ep.* 3.21)[1]. The letter is instructive enough to be given in full:

> Dear Cornelius Priscus,
>
> I hear that Valerius Martialis has died and I take it to heart. He was talented, clever, and keen, and his writings contained a lot of humour and mockery, but were also full of compliments. (2) I had sent him on his way with a travel allowance when he retired from Rome: I had given it (*dederam*) in recognition of our friendship (*amicitiae*), I had given it (*dederam*) also in recognition of the verses he has composed about me. (3) It was an ancient tradition to reward with honours or money those who had written the praises of individuals or cities; but in our days, like much else that was splendid and excellent, this was among the first things to go out of fashion. For now that we have ceased to perform praiseworthy deeds, we think it inappropriate to be praised at all. (4) You want to know the verses for which I rendered my thanks (*gratiam rettuli*)? I would refer you to the publication, if I did not know some of them by heart; if you like these, you can look up the rest in the book. (5) He addresses his Muse, instructs her to seek my house on the Esquiline, to appoach respectfully:
>
>> But look to it that that you do not knock drunkenly on his eloquent door at an unsuitable time. He devotes his days in full to stern Minerva, while for his audience in the centumviral court he works at speeches that the ages of posterity will be able to compare even to the productions of Cicero. You will more safely go to him at a later hour, when the lamp is lit: that is a suitable time, when Bacchus revels, when the rose is mistress of the feast, and hairs drip with perfume. Then let me be read even by the likes of stiff Cato. (Mart. 10.20 [19].12–21)

---

[1] Pliny's letter must be later than 101, the date of publication of Martial's last book, but not later than 104 (see Sherwin-White 1966: 31–32). On the dates of publication of Martial's books see the Appendix.

(6) Is it not deserved that he who has written this about me was then seen off by me as a good friend (*amicissime*) and is now mourned by me as a good friend (*ut amicissimum*)? For he gave me (*dedit*) the most that he was able to, and would have given (*daturus*) more if he had been able to. However, what greater gift can a man be given (*dari*) than fame and praise and immortality? "But his writings will not be immortal". Perhaps not, but yet he wrote them as if they would. Greetings,

Gaius Plinius

The addressee Cornelius Priscus either was consul or would become consul soon after, whereas Pliny himself had been consul a few years before[2]. Thus, when Pliny writes that "we" have ceased to be subjects for panegyric (3), he is referring to the restricted scope for the acquisition of glory by senators, now that great deeds have become the prerogative of the emperor[3]. However, the purpose of the letter is to demonstrate from Pliny's own example that merit may still earn praise, and praise still earn fitting reward. The person providing the praise stands outside the circle drawn by the first-person plural: it is appreciated when he approaches respectfully (5). But in spite of this clearly articulated difference in status the relationship between Martial and Pliny is called *amicitia*, even emphatically so (2, 6). Whether there had been more to the *amicitia* than the exchange recorded in the letter is not clear: Pliny suggests that *amicitia* and verses were the two counts on which Martial had a claim to gratitude (2), but he may mean that the existence of the *amicitia* was based on the verses. In any case he talks of the "the verses for which I rendered my thanks" (4), and after quoting them asks if their author had not a right to be treated "as a good friend" (6). The obligation the poetry had created was apparently a lasting one: "then ... and ... now". *Now* Pliny reciprocates by honouring Martial's memory, *then* he had reciprocated by covering the expenses of the poet's journey to Spain. But Pliny had not "paid" Martial his "wages": he had rendered him *gratia* (4), he had *given* him something (2). In the same way Martial

[2] The consulate of Cornelius Priscus almost certainly fell in 104; cf. C.P. Jones 1968: 118. Pliny himself had been consul in 100.

[3] Cf. *Ep.* 3.7.14: *quidquid est temporis ... si non datur factis (nam horum materia in aliena manu), certe studiis proferamus.* Indeed, the subject of Martial's eulogy is Pliny's oratory.

had *given* something to Pliny (6): not just poetry, but what poetry could bestow: "fame and praise and immortality".

Pliny's letter provides a perfect illustration of the Roman code of literary patronage[4]. There is patronage, because there is an informal relationship characterised by asymmetry, duration, and exchange, and the patronage is literary, because the exchange partly consist in literature. Support for the poet is motivated not by the quality of his poetry, nor by his financial circumstances, but by the services he renders with his poetry. If a poet offers "fame and praise and immortality", he is entitled to an adequate return. In the rest of this chapter it will be studied how the model provided by Pliny's letter relates to the evidence of the *Epigrams* themselves.

Preliminary: "You" and "I" in Martial

There are many poems of Martial which plainly praise their addressee, yet do not admit of a confident identification of that addressee. On the other hand, there are many poems of Martial which provide all the data a modern student of literary patronage could want. The difference is likely to correspond to a difference in Martial's intentions. Poems of the second group were apparently meant to contribute to the addressee's reputation among the readers—present and future—of the *Epigrams*. Poems of the first group, however, apparently had fulfilled a function for the addressee when they were offered to him or recited in his presence, but their publication must have been motivated by other reasons than that of presenting him to the public at large[5]. In the case of such poems, there may be "infor-

---

[4] This formulation deliberately echoes Peter White's conclusion of his discussion of this same letter: "There did not exist a Roman code of literary patronage" (White 1978: 84). Further discussion of the letter is to be found at pp. 142–145.

[5] Fowler 1995 seems to suggest that those epigrams of Martial which present themselves as occasional are so only by way of generic pretence; in this context he stresses that no text can in and of itself disprove (or prove) its own fictionality. But various types of additional evidence (both about specific texts and about more general patterns in which these texts might fit) make it possible to form plausible hypotheses. Fowler seems to suspect that the search for such hypotheses is generally motivated by a wish to provide the texts with a specious transparency, or even to efface their textuality, but I hope that the sequel will bear out that that is not the case in the present book.

mation gaps", in the sense that information which was originally present in the context of situation is not necessarily recorded in the text[6]. The implications for the study of literary patronage are particularly severe when the missing information concerns the identity of the addressee. I will give a few examples.

In Martial's twelfth book we read the following poem on the birthday of Virgil:

> Maiae Mercurium creastis Idus,
> Augustis redit Idibus Diana,
> Octobres Maro consecrauit Idus.
> Idus saepe colas et has et illas,
> qui magni celebras Maronis Idus. (12.67)

> Ides of May, you brought forth Mercury, on the Ides of August Diana returns, but the Ides of October are hallowed by Virgil. May you often honour both the former and the latter Ides, you who celebrate the Ides of great Virgil.

Friedländer in his commentary identifies the unnamed addressee as Silius Italicus, and he is almost certainly right[7]. Martial had earlier addressed epigrams to Silius on the latter's acquisition of Virgil's tomb (11.48 and 50 [49]), and it is known from Pliny that at this tomb Silius "celebrated Virgil's birthday more devoutly than his own" (*Ep.* 3.7.8). If Friedländer's hypothesis is correct, this poem is evidence for the relationship between Martial and Silius, but we should realise that the hypothesis could only be framed because of the presence of additional data. When such data are not forthcoming, the absence of a name precludes the identification of the person honoured by Martial[8].

---

[6] My term "information gap" renders "Informationsdefizit", as discussed by Rösler 1980: 41–45.

[7] L. Friedländer 1886: 2.256.

[8] Apart from 12.67, the non-satirical epigrams to an unnamed addressee (on the importance of their being non-satirical see immediately below) all accompany gifts: 2.85, 4.19, 9.54, 10.94. One may compare, however, poems to (or on) named slaves, whose owner remains unnamed, e.g. 6.52, 7.87, 8.46 (where the identity of the owner may be deduced from 8.50 [51]: see p. 47), 9.56, 9.103 (where the identity of the owner may be deduced from inscriptional evidence: see p. 66, n. 91). Cf. White 1974: 40–41 (who also mentions 5.42, but there the second person seems to be generic).

But even if Martial does address someone by name, he often uses only a part of the name, mostly the *cognomen*[9]; if this *cognomen* is a common one, identification is often difficult or even impossible, for us as well as for Martial's original readers. Martial was well aware of the issue, as is proved by the introduction to Book 9. Here we find an epigram addressed to one Avitus, accompanied by a letter to Toranius, in which Martial writes: "The epigram ... is addressed to Stertinius the senator... I thought I should write to you about this, so that you might know the identity of this man I call Avitus" (9.*ep.*). But the letter to Toranius is an isolated instance in the text of Martial, and normally we have to make do with the epigrams themselves. Hence the identification of other Aviti in Martial with the senatorial Stertinius (*suff.* 92) meant here, is contested[10]. Similar problems arise with the Rufi and Severi addressed by Martial, because both *Rufus* and *Seuerus* belong to the ten most frequent Latin *cognomina*[11]. Whenever a Severus occurs in Martial, Friedländer identifies him with the son of Silius Italicus, mourned in 9.86, and this looks plausible, until one encounters a Severus some years after 9.86, in 11.57: at least this one cannot be Silius' son[12]. But the real extent of the issue is shown by the poems for (or on) Rufus. There are no less than five Rufi whose *nomen* Martial mentions: Camonius, Canius, Instanius[13], Julius and Safronius Rufus. When we encounter a poem addressed to, say, Instanius Rufus (like 7.68, 8.50 [51], 12.95) or just Instanius (like 8.73, 12.98), we have no difficulty, but how about all

---

9 In a few cases he uses the *praenomen* only, which was a token of affection; cf. Howell 1980: 118.

10 Contrast Citroni 1975: 67 with Howell 1980: 144: one man according to Citroni, more than one according to Howell, following the unpublished dissertation of P. White (1972); cf. also Henriksén 1998–99: 1.52.

11 See the statistics of Kajanto 1965: 29–30.

12 Cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 2.196 and the index (by C. Frobeen) under "Severus (Silius)" (2.380).

13 Most editions print *Instantius* with the manuscripts. But from 8.50 (51).23–26 it appears that the vocative of the name has seven letters, whereas *Instanti* counts eight. H. A. J. Munro *apud* L. Friedländer 1886: 2.29 (followed by Shackleton Bailey in his editions of 1990 and 1993) assumed that Martial referred to an incorrect spelling *Istanti*, more closely approximating to actual pronunciation. But the name surely was *Instanius*: see Alföldy 1969: 164. Thus also Merli 1996a: 211–12.

the poems addressed to *Rufus* pure and simple? In these cases it is not even always certain that "Rufus" is real at all.

The problem arises when the addressee is not praised or flattered, but criticised or ridiculed. I shall give two examples from poems addressed to a Rufus. In one poem a Rufus is denounced not only as an inheritance-hunter, but as an incompetent inheritance-hunter at that:

> Cum me captares, mittebas munera nobis:
> postquam cepisti, das mihi, Rufe, nihil.
> Vt captum teneas, capto quoque munera mitte,
> de cauea fugiat ne male pastus aper. (9.88)

> When you were trying to catch me, you used to send me presents: now that you have caught me, you give me nothing, Rufus. In order to keep me now that I am caught, go on sending presents now that I am caught: otherwise the boar might get hungry and flee from the cave.

It is hard to imagine that Martial wrote this poem for presentation to "Rufus"; more probably he composed it for the entertainment of his audience, employing second-person address to achieve greater liveliness and punch[14]. Second-person address allows the poet to employ a whole array of speech acts which otherwise would have been denied him: exhorting, warning, reproaching, etc. Thus in another poem a Rufus is chided for beating his cook:

> Esse negas coctum leporem poscisque flagella.
> Mauis, Rufe, cocum scindere quam leporem. (3.94)

> You say the hare is not well cooked and call for the whip. Rufus, you would rather carve the cook than the hare.

Elsewhere Martial is perfectly callous about the beating of cooks (8.23), and the point of his criticism here is not that "Rufus" is cruel, but that he feigns a reason not to share his food with the guests[15]. Such a criticism can hardly have been really uttered in the face of the host, and again the more natural assumption is that the communication with "Rufus" is fictional. But even a fictional communication

---

[14] Of course, the first person may be as fictional as the second person; see further below, pp. 48–58.

[15] Poem 3.13 is exactly analogous. On cruel punishments of cooks (and waiters) see D'Arms 1991: 175.

situation can be constructed around real individuals, and the two poems as such do not preclude the hypothesis that they satirise an avaricious person called *Rufus* (or two such persons). But from the very beginning of his *corpus* of miscellaneous epigrams Martial informs his readers that in such cases not only the contexts of utterance, but also the names are fictional.

Martial begins the introductory letter to the first book with the following words:

> Spero me secutum in libellis meis tale temperamentum ut de illis queri non possit quisquis de se bene senserit, cum salua infimarum quoque personarum reuerentia ludant; quae adeo antiquis auctoribus defuit ut nominibus non tantum ueris abusi sint sed et magnis. (1.*ep.*1–5)

> I hope that I have struck such a balance in my modest compositions that no one with a good conscience will be able to complain about them, inasmuch as they have fun without losing respect for even the humblest characters. But the ancient authors were so lacking in this that they made free not only with real names, but even with great ones.

We know from Suetonius (*Dom.* 8.3) that Domitian prosecuted libellous writings against leading citizens. This implies that Martial and his contemporaries could no longer attack "great names", unless they took care to remain anonymous[16]. Lesser names were apparently not legally protected, but Martial reassures his readers that he does not even attack those, abstaining as a matter of principle from any criticism of "real names" (*nomina uera*). Martial's use of this term presupposes an opposition to "fictional names" (*nomina ficta*), and this opposition is indeed attested in a letter by Pliny, who writes on the work of one Vergilius Romanus: "He honoured virtue, criticised vice; he used fictional names properly, real names suitably; only in my own case did too much kindness lead him to exaggerate ..." (*Ep.* 6.21.5–6). The implication clearly is that Vergilius Romanus used real names when he praised virtue, but fictional names when he castigated vice. His audience will not have had any difficulty in under-

---

[16] Martial repeatedly has to defend himself against allegations that he is the author of anonymously circulating abusive epigrams: see 7.12, 7.72, 10.3, 10.5, 10.33 (cf. also 5.15.2). Note that in 10.5.1–2 senators are specified as the victims of the abuse. From Suet. *Dom.* 23.2 it appears that even Domitian himself was sometimes attacked in anonymous epigrams (as earlier emperors had been: cf. Suet. *Tib.* 28, 59, *Nero* 39.2, Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.4, 4.31.1, 14.48.1).

standing his practice, because they were familiar with similar techniques from satire. Persius and Juvenal, and presumably the lost satirists of the Domitianic period such as Turnus, call the persons they attack by type-names or by names of figures from the past, but not by the names of contemporary individuals; in this respect they exercise more restraint than their predecessor Horace, whose satirical thrusts often concern real names, if never great ones[17]. Apparently, in the course of time, the scope for personal invective became ever more limited, in satire as well as in epigram.

Nevertheless, Martial feels constrained to explain his procedure, and sometimes reckons with uncertainty in his audience. An example is the following epigram:

> Nomen Athenagorae credis[18], Callistrate, uerum.
> Si scio, dispeream, qui sit Athenagoras.
> Sed puta me uerum, Callistrate, dicere nomen:
> non ego sed uester peccat Athenagoras. (9.95b)

> You believe, Callistratus, that *Athenagoras* is a real name. I'd be damned if I know who Athenagoras is. But suppose, Callistratus, that I do use a real name. Then it is not I but your friend Athenagoras who is at fault.

If some Athenagoras believes he has been satirised by Martial (viz. in 9.95, the epigram immediately preceding 9.95b), then not Martial, but Athenagoras is to blame—for answering to the satirical description. Martial is not interested in criticising individuals, but in satirising types: "My books know how to observe this rule: to spare persons, to speak of vices (*parcere personis, dicere de uitiis*) (10.33.9–10)[19].

---

[17] For a short sketch of the practices of Horace, Persius, and Juvenal see Coffey 1989: 90–91, 110, 136–37; a thorough treatment of the names in Horace's satires is to be found in Rudd 1966: 132–152.

[18] Shackleton Bailey chooses the variant *quaeris* and translates "You ask Athenagoras' real name" (1993: 2.315), assuming that "Callistratus" believed *Athenagoras* to be a pseudonym. But that would result in an inconsistent transition from the issue of pseudonyms (for which cf. 2.23) to that of real names; cf. Merli 1996b: 2.788, n.135.

[19] Cf. Phdr. 3.*prol*.45–50, where the same point as in Mart. 9.95b.3–4 is followed by the articulation of the general principle *neque enim notare singulos mens est mihi,/ uerum ipsam uitam et mores hominum ostendere.*

Callistratus apparently did not know that this was Martial's practice, and believed that poem 9.95 mocked a real "Athenagoras"[20]. But even if one does know that Martial did not write personal invective, one cannot always be certain whether a person mentioned or addressed by Martial is fictional or not. Witnesses to this uncertainty are the indices to the major editions of Martial, which all distinguish between fictional and real persons, but do not all put the same persons in the same categories. A certain measure of subjectivity is inevitable, because one cannot always objectively draw the line between friendly banter, which would still admit of a real name, and offensive ridicule, which would not. For this reason, when discussing the fictionality or otherwise of persons in Martial, I will often use such words as "perhaps", "probably", or "obviously", thereby indicating the varying amount of subjectivity that I attribute to my judgement.

One specific type of uncertainty can be illustrated by returning to the example of Rufus. There are three poems in which *Rufus* is fictional according to Frobeen's index in Friedländer's commentary, but probably real according to Gilbert and Heraeus, and certainly real according to Shackleton Bailey: 5.51, 5.72 and 6.89[21]. The first is a skoptic epigram on a would-be orator (unnamed), the second a mythological joke at the expense of a mannered poet (also unnamed), the third an anecdote on the bibulous "Panaretus". In all three epigrams, Rufus is no part of the contents of the poem and appears only

[20] One may ask why at such a late stage in Martial's production uncertainty could still arise. The answer is probably that in 9.95 Martial untypically used the combination of a *nomen* and a *cognomen* (*Alfius ... Athenagoras*), which is more suggestive of reference to a specific person than his normal practice of using only a single name (most commonly a *cognomen*, but occasionally a *praenomen* or a *nomen*). It must be noted, however, that both the reading *Alfius* (Heraeus: *Alphius* mss) and the interpretation of the epigram are uncertain; see Heraeus 1976: LI, and for more recent doxography Henriksén 1998–99: 2.145–50 (whose own interpretation, based on Barwick 1932: 65, is unconvincing in itself and does not explain *peccat* in 9.95b.4).

[21] On 6.89 Frobeen deviates from Friedländer, who tentatively identifies Rufus here with Instanius (1886: 1.467, 470). Shackleton Bailey's opinion is that of 1993; in 1989 he took the *Rufus* of 5.51 as real, the one of 5.72 as fictional or uncertain, while the one of 6.89 was missing from his "Index nominum". To add one other voice: Grewing 1997: 526 considers the *Rufi* of 5.51 and 6.89 "possibly real" (cf. also 569), but the one of 5.72 "probably fictional".

in a vocative; I call this phenomenon, which is quite common in Martial, the *isolated vocative*. Now it is of course possible that the use of the isolated vocative is merely a variant of the direct address to the victim in skoptic epigrams: in both cases a fictional name would be introduced in order to achieve dialogic form. But there is a difference: the addressee in the isolated vocative is not satirised himself, and therefore *need* not be fictional.

When one draws up an inventory of all the isolated vocatives in Martial, one finds three classes of names. The first class consists of names which occur nowhere else in Martial (such as *Atilius* in 9.85); in itself, these could be fictional just as well as real. Secondly, there are names which occur elsewhere both as a real and as a fictional name (such as *Lupus* in 11.88)[22]; these are also inconclusive. But thirdly, one also finds names which elsewhere occur exclusively as real names of friends of Martial: Faustinus, Severus, Avitus, Castricus, Flaccus, etc; when one takes this third category and compares the epigrams with an isolated vocative on the one side, and the epigrams with fully developed address to the same name on the other side, one notices a remarkable convergence of themes, moods and attitudes[23]. E.g., when *Flacce* occurs as an isolated vocative, it is in epigrams with sexual themes, which is in accordance with the tastes of the Flaccus of the other poems[24]. So it looks as if poems with an isolated vocative were addressed to real persons[25]. By employing the isolated vocative, Martial was able not only to "motivate" his speech act by suggesting a context in which it is uttered, but also to "dedi-

---

[22] *Lupus* is real in 10.48, fictional in 9.2, 11.55 and elsewhere; see further below, p. 60.

[23] Cf. for a full discussion Cartault 1903.

[24] Poems with isolated vocatives on sexual themes: 7.82, 9.33, 11.95, 11.98, 11.100, 11.101; similar poems with full address: 1.57, 11.27, 12.74; cf. also 4.42 and 8.55 (56). On the prosopographical problems surrounding Flaccus see below, p. 59.

[25] This is the conclusion of Gilbert 1896: 380: "eae [scil. personae], quae vocativo a poeta appellantur, si ipsae nihil ad rem narratam attinent (ubi ego 'ad eum' scripsi), mihi quidem omnes verae videntur" (similarly Heraeus 1976: 380; Shackleton Bailey in 1990 drops the label "ad eum", but in 1993 treats addressees in the isolated vocative as real).

cate" his poem to a real person as a mark of homage[26]. In the case of the three poems to *Rufe*, we may assume that they were addressed to a real Rufus, even if we cannot be quite sure to which one[27].

To conclude the discussion of *Rufi*, something must be said about the complicated case of 8.52, where *Rufus* is "doubtless Instantius [i.e. Instanius] Rufus" according to Friedländer in his commentary, but "plainly a fictional name" according to Heraeus in his "Index nominum"; Shackleton Bailey lists him as fictional or uncertain in 1990, but as real in 1993. This poem has an isolated vocative; but it is not *Rufe*, but *Caediciane*[28], to whom Martial narrates how he once lent a barber to Rufus, who insisted on such a thorough shave that the barber returned with a beard himself. Now it is interesting to note that this poem occurs in an environment of poems for Instanius: 8.50 (51) explicitly honours him, and 8.46 is addressed to a slave Cestus, who in 8.50 (51) turns out to be his page. Do we have, then, three poems delivered at the same banquet, 8.46 being addressed to the cupbearer, 8.50 (51) to the host, 8.52, gently mocking the host, to a guest, Caedicianus?[29] The problem with this hypothesis is that names of the type *Caedicianus* are often used by Martial as fictional names, so that there must be a strong suspicion that *Caedicianus* itself is also fictional[30]. We cannot simply state that names in the isolated vocative are *always* real.

---

[26] On "dedication" of single poems (to be distinguished from the dedication of books) see ch. 2, p. 129. On (more or less) isolated address as a mark of homage in Hellenistic poetry, Catullus, and the Augustans, see briefly Kroll 1924: 231–35.

[27] Cartault 1903: 111 reasonably suggests the humorous Canius Rufus (on whom see below, p. 59) as the addressee of these three poems, as well as of five others in which *Rufe* occurs as an isolated vocative (2.11, 2.29, 2.84, 3.82, 3.97) and which had already been assigned to Canius in Friedländer's commentary; one might add the non-skoptic 2.48.

[28] The name *Caedicianus* occurs elsewhere in a further isolated vocative (1.118), and twice in a closely related auxiliary function, as belonging to the person who asks the question which sets the epigram in motion (10.32, 10.84).

[29] Arguments that at least 8.46 and 8.50 (51) could well have been performed at a symposium are provided at p. 101.

[30] Names of the shape – ⏑ *ĭānus* are very convenient metrically, especially in elegiac distichs. Apart from *Caedicianus*, Martial has *Aemilianus*, *Caecilianus*, *Gargilianus*, *Laetilianus*, *Maecilianus*, *Mamurianus*, *Nasidianus*, *Pontilianus*, *Postumianus*, *Septicianus*, *Sextilianus*, *Sosibianus*, and *Tongilianus*, which are all fictional, and *Papirianus*, which only occurs in an isolated vocative (8.81).

But poem 8.52 also raises other questions. Was Martial so affluent that he could afford a specialised slave such as a barber? And is not the epigram too exaggerated anyway to be used as evidence for Martial's real life? What is at stake here is the status of the "I" in Martial's epigrams. We saw that the addressee is sometimes fictional, sometimes real. Is that also true of the speaker? And if so, what is the relation between the fictionality of the one and of the other? These questions are not merely theoretical ones, but have an immediate bearing on the study of literary patronage. In order to arrive at a correct assessment of Martial's social position, his material resources, and his dependence on his patrons, it is necessary to establish when he speaks in his own voice and when he does not.

When the "I" in an epigram by Martial addresses a real person, this "I" is presumably Martial himself: otherwise no communication from poet to addressee would ensue. But communication did ensue: we have seen above that Pliny considered his obligation to Martial real enough to reward him with real money. Now it might of course be argued that Pliny would also be flattered if Martial's speaker were fictional; in that case he would thank Martial not for *saying* something laudatory, but for *making his speaker say* something laudatory. But this is not how Pliny understood the poem. After having described Martial the man, and before proceeding to quote the second half of the poem, he paraphrases its first half: "He addresses his Muse, instructs her to seek my house on the Esquiline, to approach respectfully" (*Ep.* 3.21.5). It is obvious that Pliny took the speaker of the poem to be Martial himself. This is indeed the natural thing to do if one is not committed in advance to a certain poetics. The idea that the speaker of a poem is *always* fictional is a modernist doctrine, tied to modernist poetry, and not valid for periods in which poetry could be taken as direct communication from poet to addressee, so that poets could *perform* speech acts with their poetry rather than merely *represent* speech acts[31].

Even when the addressee is fictional, the "I" may be real, as can be illustrated from the following poem:

[31] Cf. Rösler 1985. Apart from distinguishing between real and fictional "I", as I do in what follows, I would now give greater attention to (literary as well as non-literary) "roles". I hope to return to the question in a future publication.

"Dic uerum mihi, Marce, dic amabo;
nil est quod magis audiam libenter."
Sic et cum recitas tuos libellos,
et causam quotiens agis clientis,
oras, Gallice, me rogasque semper.
Durum est me tibi quod petis negare.
Vero uerius ergo quid sit audi:
uerum, Gallice, non libenter audis." (8.76)

"Tell me the truth, Marcus, please do; there is nothing which I would like to hear more." In this way, both when you recite your books and whenever you plead a client's case, (5) you beg me, Gallicus, and ask me all the time. It is hard for me to refuse you your request. Therefore hear what is truer than true: the truth, Gallicus, is what you do *not* like to hear.

Gallicus is depicted as vain and (by implication) as a bad writer, and in the only other poem in which the name occurs (8.22) he is satirised; so he is presumably a fictional addressee. Yet the speaker of this poem is called *Marcus*, like Martial himself, and is presumably to be identified with the poet, just like speakers called *Marcus* or *Martialis* elsewhere in the *corpus*[32]. We need to recognise that a fiction can be *partial* (or rather that all fictions are partial, because something from the "real" world must always be retained in the fictional world). In a communication situation involving speaker, addressee, and context of utterance, any element can be fictional without the others necessarily being fictional as well. Thus, it is perfectly possible for a speaker to speak *as himself*, but to imagine an addressee who is absent or does not even exist. So Martial's poem does not present an anomaly. He wished to represent *himself* (and not some fictional construct) as protesting against the demeaning situation of having to be a flatterer. But because he could not remonstrate with a real addressee, he had to invent a fictional one.

If the addressee is fictional, but the speaker does *not* unmistakably identify himself as the poet, there is always the possibility that the speaker, too, is fictional. One criterion to be employed in deciding which is the case, is whether the self-presentation in the poem under

[32] *Marcus*: 1.5, 1.55, 3.5, 5.29, 5.63, 6.47; cf. 10.73; *Martialis*: 1.1, 1.117, 6.82, 7.72, 10.9, 10.92, and the headings of the introductory epistles to Books 2, 8, and 12. Of these compositions at least 5.29 and 5.63, likewise employ a fictional addressee.

consideration is consistent with the self-presentation in other poems, especially in such poems where the speaker can be identified with the poet. A case in point is provided by those epigrams in which the speaker specifies his domicile. In 5.22 the "I" complains about undertaking long journeys from his own abode on the Quirinal to the dwelling of "Paulus" on the Esquiline, only to be told that his august patron is not in. "Paulus" looks fictional, but it appears from other poems (to real addressees) that Martial did live on the Quirinal, at first in a rented apartment, later in a house of his own[33]. He will have expected readers familiar with his work or with his circumstances to assume that in 5.22 he was speaking in his own voice.

A blatant example of *in*consistency between speaker identities, on the other hand, is provided by the epigrams on marriage. There are a number of epigrams in which the speaker refers to his wife, and a number in which he implies that he is a bachelor[34]. Now unless we postulate for Martial a rapid succession of divorces and remarriages[35], we must conclude that the speakers in one of these groups are fictional[36]. But that does not imply that they are "real" in the other group. All references to a wife or the absence of one are jocular, and it is perhaps better to say that for the sake of a joke a poet could assume a *persona* which fitted that joke. Whether this *persona* corresponded with his identity outside the context of the joke was not necessarily at issue. The audience would understand that no biographical information was being conveyed, and—to stick to the pres-

[33] An apartment is specified in 1.108 (where the addressee could be fictional) and must also be meant in the contemporaneous 1.117. From Book 9 onwards Martial boasts of a house (9.18, 9.97, 10.58; for the location cf. also 10.20 [19] and 11.1). The intermediate epigrams 5.22 and 6.27 may refer to either, but more probably to the apartment; see Citroni 1975: 330 and 357, and below, p. 337.

[34] The speaker is married in 3.92, 4.24, 11.43, 11.104 (and cf. 11.84), unmarried in 2.49, 8.12, 10.8, 11.19, 11.23; 2.92 has been interpreted both ways.

[35] This is actually done by Bell 1984. For other views on Martial's civil status see Scamuzzi 1966: 180–87 (who argues that Martial was married) and Sullivan 1991: 25–26 (who argues that he was not).

[36] Thus Schuster 1930, but the point was already argued by Lessing in his *Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten*, first published in 1771; see Lessing 1973: 476–81 = 11.266–71 Lachmann–Muncker.

ent example—would not try to determine whether Martial was "really married" or not[37].

If pronouncements of an "I" on matrimony or celibacy are not necessarily to be taken as autobiographical, the same could conceivably apply to first-person utterances on wealth or poverty. I start with a poem presupposing wealth:

> Hospes eras nostri semper, Matho, Tiburtini.
>   Hoc emis. Imposui: rus tibi uendo tuum. (4.79)

> You were a permanent visitor at my Tiburtine estate, Matho. Now you buy it. I have cheated you: I am selling you an estate that is already yours.

This epigram is usually taken as evidence that Martial really owned an estate at Tibur (Tivoli), which he really sold[38]. But rather than friendly bantering with an assiduous friend, Martial seems to criticise an importunate guest. Moreover, the name *Matho* is always fictional in other epigrams, so that it is likely to be fictional here. If that is the case, the question becomes whether the "I" is fictional too. There are some indications that it is. Book 4 contains other poems set in Tibur, and one in which Martial, still staying at Baiae, announces his intention of coming to Tibur to visit Faustinus[39]; now it seems more probable that Martial stayed at Tibur as Faustinus' guest than that he owned a villa which he never mentions elsewhere. In fact the deal with "Matho" could well have been made by Faustinus (or one of his neighbours); it could have been the subject of a Tiburtine anecdote, wittily versified by Martial for the amusement of his host. In this case the addressee would have been real, but ad-

---

[37] Cf. Slings 1990: 11–12 on the "performer I" as situated between the "biographical I" and the "fictional I".

[38] E.g. Hardie 1983: 51 and 52. It is sometimes assumed that Martial here refers to his *Nomentanum* (Kuthan 1932; cf. Scamuzzi 1966: 169–72), but he certainly did not sell that before Book 10: see 10.61, 92.

[39] The poem announcing the visit is 4.57; the poems set in Tibur closely follow in the order of the published book: 4.60 and 62. For Faustinus' estate at Tibur see also 5.71 and 7.80.

dressed under a pseudonym in a fictional context of utterance and by a fictional speaker[40].

The situation is quite different with regard to an estate at Nomentum (near modern Mentana): this Martial mentions about a dozen times, from the early *Xenia* through the second edition of Book 10, and still in Book 12, mostly in poems addressed to named friends and patrons[41]; in this case we may safely take the information as autobiographical. The same holds for a house in the City, which Martial only mentions in poems to real addressees[42], e.g. in a request to the emperor for permission to draw water from an aqueduct:

> Est mihi—sitque precor longum te praeside, Caesar—
> rus minimum, parui sunt et in urbe lares. (9.18.1–2)

> I own—and I pray that I may long keep it under your rule, Caesar— a tiny estate, and I also own a small house in the city.

This is a serious speech-act, and even though Martial quite probably underplays the size of his possessions, there can be no doubt about the reality of these possessions themselves.

That Martial was indeed moderately well-off is confirmed by his references to slaves; these often occur in jocular epigrams to fictional addressees, where the speaker is liable to be fictional as well, but also in epigrams to real addressees; in the latter we find references to a bailiff and a bailiff's wife (on the Nomentan estate and later in Spain), as well as to an errand-boy, a flute-player and a page[43]. A category in itself are the epitaphs on favourite slaves who have died young, such as 1.101[44]:

---

[40] On to the use of pseudonyms cf. 2.23. There are two other poems on a *rus* which probably employ a fictional "I": 6.5 and 11.18 (on the latter see Kay 1985: 106).

[41] Cf. 13.15, 13.42, 13.119, 1.105, 2.38, 6.27, 6.43, 7.31, 7.49, 7.93, 8.61, 9.18, 9.54, 9.60, 10.44, 10.48, 10.58, 10.92 (cf. 10.61), 10.94, 12.57; of all these poems, only 2.38 has a fictional addressee. From 13.119 it appears that Martial grew wine at his *Nomentanum* (cf. also 10.48.19), and it is possible that this provided him with an income; cf. Hardie 1983: 51.

[42] See above, n.33.

[43] Fictional address e.g. in 2.32, 2.44, 5.50, 7.35, 8.13, 8.67, 11.39; cf. 3.46 on a freedman. Real address in 3.100 (errand-boy), 4.10 (errand-boy), 5.78 (flute-player), 8.63 (page), 10.48 (*uilica*), 10.92 (*uilicus*), 12.18 (in Spain: *uilica*, *uilicus*, *pueri*); cf. 8.52 (barber), discussed above. The lists of Martial's slaves in Scamuzzi 1966:

Illa manus quondam studiorum fida meorum
et felix domino notaque Caesaribus,
destituit primos uiridis Demetrius annos:
quarta tribus lustris addita messis erat. (1.101.1–4)

Once the trusted secretary of my studies, he whose handwriting brought good fortune to his master and was known to the Caesars, young Demetrius has abandoned his early years: four harvests had been added to three lustres.

Because of the claim that the Caesars had known Demetrius' handwriting, Martial must be speaking seriously and be referring to his real secretary. Not only did he own slaves (which all but the most indigent did), but he had a staff adequate to the management of his town house and his suburban estate as well as to the pursuit of his social and cultural activities.

But the most important single fact about Martial's financial resources is that he was a Roman knight, which presupposed a census of at least 400,000 sesterces[45]. Before discussing what this meant in practical terms, I will take a brief look at the evidence for Martial's equestrian rank, in order to give another illustration of some of the methodological points made above. There are five poems in which the speaker—not to prejudice the question—refers to himself as a knight. The first of these (3.95) is a satiric epigram addressed to a fictional "Naevolus", who always answers the speaker's greetings, without ever being the first to greet; yet the speaker feels in no way inferior and lists his assets: an imperial privilege called the *ius trium liberorum* (5–6), success and fame as a poet (7–8), a tribunate and the equestrian rank connected with it (9–10), and successful intercession with the emperor on behalf of clients (11–12). The addressee is fictional, but the self-presentation of the speaker is consistent with

178, n. 167, Garrido-Hory 1981: 69–70 and Sullivan 1991: 164, n. 58 are compiled from both groups of poems indiscriminately; Garrido-Hory and Sullivan moreover include a number of epigrams on *pueri* who need not belong to the "I".

[44] See also 1.88, as well as 5.34 and 37 (both on Erotion; cf. 10.61). Poems 6.52 and 11.91 *might* be on other people's slaves (as 6.28–29 and 6.68 certainly are).

[45] On Martial as a knight see esp. Allen *et al.* 1969–70: 345–49, White 1978: 88–89 (on the equestrian rank of poets in general, revised in White 1993: 5–13), Saller 1983: 250–52.

Martial's self-presentation elsewhere[46], so that there is no obstacle to believing that Martial himself is the speaker. The situation is similar with the second epigram (5.13), where the speaker addresses an arrogant millionaire, a fictional "Callistratus", and states that he himself, though "of modest means" (*pauper*), is nevertheless "a knight neither unknown nor of ill repute" (2) and highly successful as a poet (3–4). In the third epigram (5.17) the speaker mocks a "Gellia", who only accepts marriage candidates of senatorial standing and looks down on the condition of "knights like me" (2), but ends up marrying a minor police official. In the fourth poem (9.49) we are safely on the ground of real communication: Martial writes of a toga given to him by Parthenius, in which he used to parade "a conspicuous knight" (4); he had thanked Parthenius, an influential imperial freedman, for the gift of this toga in 8.28. The fifth and last poem (12.29 [26]), taken in itself, is more problematic: the speaker is taxed by the addressee, an unnamed senator assiduous in attending the *salutationes* of the powerful, with being a "lazy knight" (2); here the contrast knight vs. senator *could* have been invented for the sake of the epigram. But by this point in the published works of Martial, the reader—ancient as well as modern—has acquired a certain knowledge of Martial's circumstances, and will deploy this knowledge in interpreting his works. This poem is not independent evidence, but it confirms the conclusion drawn from the earlier poems.

Once it is established that Martial was a knight, it needs to be asked what it meant, or could mean, to be a knight. In 5.13 equestrian rank is combined with being *pauper*, a term which did not mean "poor" in the modern sense, but covered the entire spectrum between more than indigent (*egenus*) and less than affluent (*diues*); elsewhere too, Martial calls himself *pauper* and denies that he is *diues*[47]. Indeed, the historical evidence shows that equestrian rank did not

---

[46] For the *ius trium liberorum* see 2.90–91; for success and fame as a poet see the passages listed at p. 132, n. 131.

[47] Martial *pauper*: 2.90 (real addressee); cf. 4.77 (no addressee) and 10.10 (fictional addressee). Martial not *diues*: 5.15, 6.43, 7.46 (real addressees); cf. 2.30 (fictional addressee) and 4.77 (no addressee). On the meaning of *paupertas* see Scamuzzi 1966: 188–200 and Kay 1985: 142–43.

automatically entail wealth[48]. Moreover, it did not automatically absolve one from performing the duties of a client, something the speakers of Martial's poems repeatedly complain about. In how far Martial himself was involved in these duties, has been hotly debated[49]. If we want to achieve clarity, it is important to draw the evidence not from satirical poems to fictional addressees, where the speaker is likely to be fictional as well, but from poems to real addressees, where successful communication can only be achieved if Martial speaks in his own name[50].

One group of such poems is made up of the epigrams in which he talks about his impending departure for Spain—a biographical fact confirmed by the letter of Pliny discussed at the beginning of this chapter. In the last book to be published before the move, the second edition of Book 10 from the year 98, there are three poems addressed to real addressees in which Martial prepares or explains his decision by expressing dissatisfaction about his existence as a client in Rome. The first of these poems is 10.58, addressed to Frontinus, presumably Sex. Julius Frontinus, consul for the second time in this very year 98 and well-known author of technical works[51]. Martial had been a guest

---

[48] See Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 140–52, who argues that the majority of equestrians could not afford more than a modest lifestyle.

[49] Cf. esp. Scamuzzi 1966, Allen *et al.* 1969–70, White 1978, Saller 1983, Hardie 1983: 50–57, Garrido-Hory 1985, Holzberg 1988: 65–73, Sullivan 1991: 116–30, 159–62.

[50] Yet, as has been argued above (p. 49), it would have been possible to use epigrams to fictional addressees where the speaker is identified as Martial by traits which he shares with the "I" in poems to real addressees. Thus I think (against Damon 1997: 160–67) that the "I" is Martial in 1.108 (because he lives on the Quirinal), in 3.4 (because he sends a book on its way from Gallia Cisalpina to Rome), 10.74 (because he is a poet longing to leave Rome), 11.24 (because he is a poet whom *Roma legit*), and 12.68 (because he is a poet who now lives a quiet life far from Rome).

[51] The identification of the Frontinus of this poem with the politician and author (*PIR*^{2} I 322) is denied by White 1975: 295–96, n. 41, but it would be surprising if in a poem published (and probably written) in 98, *Frontinus* would not refer to the man who was consul in that year (as attested by the *Fasti Ostienses*: Vidman 1980: 45), the more so since Martial mentions the consulate at 10.48.20 (cf. Housman 1907: 252 = 1972: 729). Moreover, in 97 Frontinus describes Rome as *cui par nihil et nihil secundum* (*Aq.* 88.1), an almost hendecasyllabic line, which reappears a few years later at Mart. 12.8.2 (with the addition of *est* before *nihil*). It has been suspected that Frontinus' text is interpolated, but it is more likely that Martial paid Frontinus the

at his villa in Anxur (Terracina) (1–6), and acknowledges the hospitality in this epigram, which then continues in a somewhat unexpected direction. Martial contrasts the leisure at Anxur with his "fruitless toil" (8) at Rome, the unproductivity of his Nomentan farm, and the necessity of haunting, by day and by night, the thresholds of his patrons, a chore which leaves him no time for writing poetry (11–14). In this communication addressed to a high personage, which adduces biographical circumstances also attested elsewhere, there can be no question of a fictional speaker, and we must conclude that Martial was indeed involved to a high degree in the traditional duties of the client.

This conclusion is confirmed by the second poem, 10.70, in which Martial explains to Potitus why he does not produce more than one book a year[52]: he gives a long enumeration of the various services he has to render his patrons in the course of the day, only to be awarded one hundred *quadrantes* at the end, the so-called *sportula*[53]. One hundred *quadrantes* means 6 1/4 sesterces, and it is surprising that someone with a census of at least 400,000 sesterces should care for so small an amount. But we should not be duped by Martial's rhetoric: if he mentions the *sportula*, it is as a particularly degrading symbol of his dependence, not as the motive for which he has sought that dependence in the first place[54]. Not only knights, even senators were caught up in the necessity of paying court to patrons, as is attested by Martial in other epigrams (2.18, 10.10, 12.29 [26]) and by Juvenal in a well-known passage from his first satire (95–126). But when Juvenal pretends that even consuls and other well-to-do Romans were greedy for the *sportula*, his interpretation of the motives of these

compliment of quotation (thus Kappelmacher 1916), or that the line originated at a literary session of the kind extolled by Martial in 10.58, and was subsequently incorporated by both authors in their published work.

52 Potitus does not occur elsewhere, but because he is addressed as *docte Potite* (2), he must be real.

53 On the *sportula* see L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.228. This poem is very similar to 11.24, but neglected by Damon (as in n. 50), when she argues that Martial is more reluctant to don the "mask of the parasite" in poems to real than in poems to fictional addressees.

54 In 10.75, the same speaker who is prepared to pay 20,000 sesterces for an encounter with a first-class prostitute (1–2) also receives the *sportula*—which he then passes on to his slave (11–12).

people is a malignant distortion (unlike his description of their factual behaviour)[55]. Senators and knights—even when in economic difficulties—were not interested in the daily dole, which to them could have no more than token value[56], but in the more irregular and more substantial gifts that patrons might bestow on those who paid court to them: Martial describes the rewards a senator may earn for attending the *salutatio* as consulates and governorships (12.29 [26]), and Juvenal himself elsewhere specifies inheritances as the objectives of a praetor making the morning rounds (3.128–30); other large donations in money or in kind could also be expected[57].

The third poem, 10.96, addressed to Avitus, again emphasises Martial's dependence[58]. At last he makes explicit his decision to withdraw to Spain: he praises the relaxed self-sufficiency of life there, contrasts it with his hardships at Rome, and concludes:

> I, cole nunc reges, quidquid non praestat amicus
> cum praestare tibi possit, Auite, locus. (10.96.13–14)

> Well, pay court to patrons if you like, but all that you do not get from a "friend", Avitus, you can get from a place.

In view of such lines, we cannot seriously doubt that Martial was indeed caught up in a web of obligations to patrons, and that the material support of these patrons made no negligible contribution to the

---

[55] Cf. esp. 99–101 and 117–23. It is generally held that Juvenal's account, in which the *sportula* is distributed in the early morning (128: *sportula, deinde forum*) conflicts with the evidence in Martial (cf. e.g. Courtney 1980: 105, Howell 1980: 285, Braund 1996a: 98), and this has been used to qualify the picture in Juvenal as a "fantasy" (Cloud 1989). But in Martial, apart from passages pointing to distribution of the *sportula* at the baths (3.7, 10.70) or at the *cena* (4.68; cf. 3.30, 3.60), there are at least three passages where the *sportula* is unequivocally described as a reward for greeting the patron at the *salutatio* (14.125, 4.26, 6.68; cf. also 1.80 with Citroni 1975: 257). So the practice probably varied, and Juvenal chose that variety which suited him best.

[56] It did of course happen that senators were in economic difficulties (cf. Talbert 1984: 50–53, Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 127–32), but this cannot have led them to being interested in the *sportula as such*, as is assumed e.g. by L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.229, n. 6 and 233–34 and Citroni 1975: 256.

[57] On upper-class attendance at the *salutatio* cf. also Col. 1.*pr*.9–10 (the reward is *fascium decus et imperium*) and the passages adduced by Saller 1982: 129; on the gifts bestowed by patrons see Saller 1982: 119–43 and 1983: 251–55.

[58] On the identity of Avitus cf. p.41.

life-style he carried on as a Roman knight, an owner of slaves and of real estate. How exactly this worked will have to emerge from the following sections, where, in accordance with the methodological points I have been making, I will concentrate on those epigrams which contain address to real patrons, taking account of epigrams with address to fictional patrons only in so far as they provide evidence for the existence of certain expectations about the behaviour of patrons and clients generally.

Asymmetry

In poem 10.48, Martial invites a number of guests to dine with him; there is reference to the produce of the Nomentan estate (7–8, 19–20) and the tone is one of warm geniality (esp. 21–24), so that there is no reason to consider the communication as fictional. This is borne out by the names of the invited guests:

> Stella, Nepos, Cani, Cerialis, Flacce, uenitis?
> Septem sigma capit, sex sumus, adde Lupum. (10.48.5–6)

> Stella, Nepos, Canius, Cerialis, Flaccus, are you coming? The couch takes seven, we are six; add Lupus.

All of these are addressed elsewhere in the *Epigrams*, and it is interesting to see what kind of company they make up.

The most prominent figure, not accidentally given pride of place, is Stella, L. Arruntius Stella with his full name, a young patrician, who was a politician as well as a poet, and associated also with Statius (*Silv.* 1.*ep.*, 1.2). Martial devotes epigrams to both sides of Stella's career: he flatteringly compares Stella's collection of love-elegies, the *Columba*, to Catullus' *Passer*, but he also describes the splendid games given by Stella after Domitian's return from the campaign against the Sarmatians, and even hints to Domitian that a consulate would be welcome—the consulate materialised only under Trajan (in 101), just in time to be included in Martial's last book[59].

---

[59] Stella's poetry: 1.7, 1.61, 6.21 (*uati*: 1), 7.14, 12.2 (3).11–14; his games: 8.78; his consulate: 9.42, 12.2 (3).10–11. These and other poems for Stella are discussed at pp. 155–159. His career is discussed in more detail at pp. 211–212.

The guest next mentioned, Nepos, makes a striking contrast. He occurs in only two other epigrams, from which it appears that he was a neighbour of Martial in Rome as well as Nomentum, in the habit of drinking the cheap wines from his cellar, because he wished to lay up the expensive ones for the dowry of his daughter[60]. It is a reasonable guess that his resources and status were not much different from Martial's.

The same guess can be made for Canius (Rufus), who is regularly mentioned as a poet and as a cheerful companion, but never as a person of wealth or influence; when in one poem Martial wonders where his friend might be, he considers the villas of certain well-to-do Romans, but no villa of Canius' own[61].

Of the fourth guest, Julius Cerealis, we know little more than that he was a poet, to whom Martial on one other occasion sent an invitation in verse[62].

Flaccus is addressed very often, sometimes to be complimented with his wealth, but never to be lauded for political, military, or administrative accomplishments; perhaps he had none, but owed his wealth to commercial activities[63]. In one poem, however, he seems to

---

[60] 13.124, 6.27.

[61] 3.20.17–18. Canius Rufus further occurs in 1.61 (see Citroni 1975: 294), 1.69, and 3.64; all these poems celebrate his good humour, and he could be the recipient of any of the humoristic epigrams addressed to an unspecified *Rufus* (cf. pp. 45–47 with n. 27). In 7.69 his fiancée Theophila is described, a learned Greek woman.

[62] 11.52. Kay 1985: 180–81 deduces from the traditions of invitation poetry that Cerealis must be a "benefactor who is socially superior", citing Phld. 27 Sider = 23 *GP* = *AP* 11.44 and Catul. 13, but the conclusion seems unwarranted, because (1) Martial insists on the quality of the food to be served (in opposition to Philodemus and Catullus), and (2) 10.48 proves that invitation poems could be addressed to social equals as well as social superiors; cf. also 5.78, where the invited guest leads the life of a client.

[63] His wealth is apparent from 1.59, where he acts as Martial's patron at Baiae (cf. also 11.80), and 12.74, where he is seen buying precious crystal from Egypt; on his journey to Cyprus see below, p. 69. He hailed from Patavium (Padua), like Stella (1.61.3–4; cf. 1.76.2). Howell 1980: 242 and Henriksén 1998–99: 1.172, 2.131, both following the unpublished dissertation of P. White, suggest that Flaccus may be identical with the Calpurnius Flaccus of Plin. *Ep*. 5.2, but the *cognomen* is common and there are no other indications. Moreover, following Sherwin-White 1966: 316, they suggest identification of this Calpurnius Flaccus with a Calpurnius who was suffect consul of 96, but that man's *cognomen* ended in *-icus* (cf. C.P. Jones 1968: 116).

be poor. There (1.76) he is urged to abandon poetry (in which he is said to excel at 1.61), because the Muses leave their worshippers penniless, unlike Minerva, who richly rewards the activities of her devotees in the Forum. Various explanations for the seeming inconsistency have been offered, among them the non-identity of Flaccus the "poor poet" with Flaccus the "rich friend"[64]. However, the poem can be interpreted not as exhorting Flaccus to *take up* a more lucrative occupation than poetry, but to *stick to* it; this occupation, carried out in the Forum under the patronage of Minerva, might be judicial oratory, but could be commerce[65]. On this view Martial does not seriously discourage Flaccus from writing poetry, but slyly hints that his own practice of the art has not brought him adequate reward, so that he could do with some financial support from his rich amateur colleague. This would give point to the magniloquent opening address "O, no cheap reward for my efforts,/ Flaccus, hope and nurseling of Antenor's dwelling", which is perhaps meant to recall Horace's similarly florid address to Maecenas in his first ode[66], where there is also a contrast of worldly occupations with the way of life of the poet (characterised in much the same imagery as is used by Martial). In this epigram the association with Maecenas is at most indirect, but elsewhere it is explicit: Martial's famous description of Maecenas' patronage in 8.55 (56) is addressed to Flaccus[67].

By contrast, no support is ever expected from the last-named guest, Lupus, although on one occasion Martial seems to hint at

---

[64] Thus the indices of L. Friedländer 1886 (by C. Frobeen), Heraeus 1976, and Shackleton Bailey 1990 and 1993. Another solution (that Flaccus was poor in his youth, and that 1.76 dates from that time) was proposed by P. White in his unpublished dissertation and accepted by Howell 1980: 242–43 and Kay 1985: 130. Cf. also Citroni 1975: 196 and 202–03 and Pitcher 1984.

[65] Minerva was the goddess of both manual and intellectual work (cf. e.g. Ov. *Fast.* 3.809–34), and could be associated with industry and commerce (Petr. 29.3, fr. 28.11 M.[4]) as well as oratory (Mart. 10.20 [19].14, Juv. 10.114–17); cf. Citroni 1975: 240–41 and Howell 1980: 277–78. The barrister of 1.98 need not be Flaccus (as assumed by Sullivan 1991: 19).

[66] With *O mihi curarum pretium non uile mearum,/ Flacce, Antenorei spes et alumne laris* (Mart. 1.76.1) cf. *Maecenas, atauis edite regibus,/ o et praesidium et dulce decus meum* (Hor. *C.* 1.1.1–2). There is a more immediate echo of Ov. *Ep.* 18 (17).163 *pretium non uile laboris*, but the context there is completely different.

[67] That epigram will be discussed below, p. 83.

some stroke of financial luck; since the few other poems addressed to Lupus do not provide more unambiguous evidence, it must remain a guess that Lupus was a social equal[68].

This survey leads to two conclusions. First, Stella and Flaccus seem to have disposed of considerably greater resources (political and economic) than Nepos, Canius Rufus, and Lupus (Julius Cerealis must remain a blank). These resources are often celebrated by Martial, but—and this is the second point—in the poem under consideration Stella and Flaccus are not treated any differently from the others. Elsewhere, too, Martial appears to be on quite easy terms with Stella and Flaccus: he frequently addresses teasing, joking, or otherwise frivolous epigrams to both of them—just as to Canius Rufus and Lupus[69]. So asymmetry did not preclude a relaxed, seemingly egalitarian intercourse. Or to put it the other way round: if we find such intercourse, we may not infer from that alone that asymmetry was absent; on some occasions, asymmetry could be in abeyance, only to be reinstated on others.

One single poem has been enough to suggest the range and variety of asymmetry in Martial, but an accurate account must of course draw on a systematic exploration of all the poems. Therefore I will now attempt a concise survey of Martial's (real) addressees, aiming at completeness for those people who are addressed on more than one occasion, but not for those who are addressed only once (I hereby anticipate the criterion of duration). I will omit the emperors and the imperial freedmen, because these will be discussed in Part III.

In a long and impassioned epigram against an unnamed detractor (6.64), Martial appeals to his success in the highest circles at Rome. The addressee has dared to carp at Martial's "trifles" (*nugae*):

---

68 The poem in which Martial hints at financial luck is 6.79 (cf. the key-words *felix* and *Fortuna* there and in 2.24). Lupus is further addressed in 5.56 and in two jocular poems where he occurs in the isolated vocative: 10.40 and 11.88. All other *Lupi* are fictional; cf. Kay 1985: 249. Balland 1998: 46–49 reads the line in which Lupus is mentioned as a sympotic riddle, hinting that his *praenomen* has seven and his *nomen* six letters, and suggests P. Iulius Lupus (*suff.* 98).

69 Martial's jocular poems for Canius Rufus and Lupus have just been referred to (nn. 54 and 61); on his jocular poems for Stella and Flaccus see pp. 155 and 163.

has, inquam, nugas, quibus aurem aduertere totam
non aspernantur proceres urbisque forique,
quas et perpetui dignantur scrinia Sili
et repetit totiens facundo Regulus ore,
quique uidet propius magni certamina Circi
laudat Auentinae uicinus Sura Dianae,
ipse etiam tanto dominus sub pondere rerum
non dedignatur bis terque reuoluere Caesar. (6.64.8–15)

these trifles, I say, to which the leaders of the city and the Forum do not scorn to lend an attentive ear, (10) which the book-cases of eternal Silius deem worthy, which Regulus repeats again and again in his eloquent voice, and which Sura praises, he who watches from nearby the contests in the great Circus and is neighbour to Diana on the Aventine, which even Lord Caesar himself, in spite of the heavy weight of his responsibilities, does not disdain to read through more than once.

Because the enumeration Silius–Regulus–Sura leads up to the emperor, and because Sura gets two lines, whereas Silius and Regulus get only one, it seems that Sura has the place of honour among Martial's non-imperial readers. L. Licinius Sura's period of greatest eminence was to come under Trajan (who awarded him a second and a third consulate), but already under Domitian he was greatly famed as a barrister, and he may have gained his first consulate already under this emperor[70]. Martial addresses only one poem to him, a rather formal composition upon his recovery from an illness (7.47), and it looks as if Martial was not very close to him[71].

To Regulus, on the other hand, Martial addresses a great many poems, and frequently mentions him as a famous barrister in poems addressed to others. This Regulus is none other than the notorious M. Aquillius Regulus, who had incurred much hatred as a political prosecutor under Nero, and had continued to make enemies under Domitian, among whom Tacitus and Pliny, who both paint his char-

[70] A first consulate in the early years of Domitian (before 87) was proposed by Barnes 1976, but refuted by Syme 1985b: 272–75 = *RP* 5.507–09 (summarised in Syme 1991c: 548–49; cf. also Syme 1991a: 405–07): the first consulate may have been in 93, but more probably was in 97, under Nerva. This makes Sura's prominence in this text of Martial all the more remarkable.

[71] Cf. Citroni 1975: 155–56.

acter in lurid colours[72]. Nothing of this transpires from Martial, who consistently praises Regulus not only for his eloquence and wealth, but also for his affability and piety; yet the relationship apparently did not continue beyond the seventh book, and one possible explanation for this is that some of Martial's other addressees objected to Regulus' company, even if only in the pages of books of epigrams[73].

Silius Italicus too had sullied his reputation by acting as an informer under Nero (who had made him consul in 68), but unlike Regulus, he had "washed off the stain", as Pliny writes in the obituary letter with which he honoured Silius' memory[74]. Pliny particularly commends that Silius, after having served as proconsul of Asia in 77/78, had settled for *otium*, devoting his time to the acquisition of villas and works of art, to the cultivation of the memory of Virgil, and to the composition of a long-winded historical epic, the *Punica*. In the years in which Martial wrote his epigrams, this work was taking shape, and was being tried out by Silius in frequent recitations[75]. Martial pays abundant homage to this side of "immortal Silius", but does not neglect to put on record his other titles to fame: his activity as an orator, his own consulate under Nero and that of his son, granted by Domitian[76]. There can be no doubt about the asymmetry at the political, social, and economic level, but it might be believed that at the poetical level both men were on equal footing—indeed Martial's reputation as a poet has generally been superior to Silius'. But Martial is careful to observe the hierarchy of the genres, even turning this into a hierarchy of their foremost practitioners; when he

---

72 See Tac. *Hist.* 4.42., Plin. *Ep.* 1.5, 1.20.14, 2.11.22, 2.20, 4.2, 4.7, 6.2. A consulate is not on record, but was plausibly inferred by Syme 1953: 161 = *RP* 1.254–55 and C.P. Jones 1970: 98, n. 7. A (rather apologetic) portrait of the man is sketched by McDermott and Orentzel 1979: 94–107.

73 Another explanation will be suggested at p. 155, where Martial's poems for Regulus will be discussed.

74 Plin. *Ep.* 3.7. On the career of Silius Italicus see McDermott and Orentzel 1977: 24–27, where the evidence is cited.

75 On the chronology of the *Punica* see Wistrand 1956; the recitations are mentioned by Pliny *Ep.* 3.7.5.

76 Martial's poems for Silius: 4.14, 7.63, 8.66, 9.86, 11.48, 11.50 (49) (on 12.67 see above, p. 40). In all of these Silius' identity as a poet is at least mentioned, but in 7.63, 8.66, and 11.48 he is also praised as an orator, and in 7.63, 8.66, 9.86 as the head of a consular family. On the group as a whole see pp. 148–150.

presents his "jests" (*ioci*) to the author of epic, he timidly suggests (with a disregard for chronology):

> sic forsan tener ausus est Catullus
> magno mittere Passerem Maroni. (4.14.13–14)
>
> thus perhaps did tender Catullus dare to send his *Passer* to great Virgil.

Although the comparison with Catullus is in itself a proud one, the pride is necessarily turned into modesty by the inevitable further comparison of Silius with his venerated model Virgil.

Licinius Sura, Aquillius Regulus and Silius Italicus were certainly the most prominent recipients of poetry by Martial, with the addition of Cocceius Nerva, the later emperor, whom Martial already addressed under Domitian, praising his "quiet life" (*quies*) and his poetry[77]. But there are many other senatorial addressees, among whom I list only those who are certain senators and certain recipients of poems on more than one occasion: Arruntius Stella, already discussed; the brothers Domitius Lucanus and Domitius Tullus, consulars and magnates[78]; Pedanius Fuscus Salinator, who became proconsul of Asia[79]; Domitius Apollinaris, suffect consul in 97[80]; Instanius Rufus, who became proconsul of Baetica[81]; and Antonius Primus, the famous leader of the Flavian party in the civil wars of 68–69[82]. In other cases, the evidence is not clear enough[83].

---

[77] 8.70 (cf. 5.28.4), 9.26. For a sketch of Nerva's position under Domitian see Syme 1958: 1.1–9; on *quies* see p. 308. The poems addressed to Nerva as emperor will be discussed in ch. 9 (pp. 437–440).

[78] Both were consul under Vespasian (not later than 73, according to Zevi 1979: 190, n. 25 and Eck 1982: 289, n. 28). Domitius Tullus was consul for the second time in 98 (Syme 1953: 151 = *RP* 1.235 and 156–57 = 246), his brother having died (Mart. 9.51 mourns his decease). Plin. *Ep.* 8.18 testifies to their enormous fortune, as well as to the disapprobation they incurred by their ways of obtaining it; Martial, of course, is entirely laudatory. See further Birley 2000: 57.

[79] Pedanius Fuscus Salinator was consul around 84 and became proconsul of Asia probably in 98/99 (Eck 1982: 331, n. 198); he was identified with Martial's Fuscus by Sherwin-White 1966: 386 and by Syme 1982–83: 256 = *RP* 4.107.

[80] See Syme 1991c: 588–602, where it is shown that the Domitius of Mart. 10.12 is also Apollinaris.

[81] He is congratulated with his appointment in 12.98. See Alföldy 1969: 164 (also on the correct form of the name [cf. above, n. 13]), Eck 1982: 336–37.

[82] The fact that Martial celebrates the quiet life of the retired septuagenarian (9.99.4, 10.23) is insufficient ground to reject the identification (as is done by

Of these senatorial addressees, Sura, Silius and Regulus, as well as Fuscus (7.28.5–6) are praised as lawyers, but there are also lawyers in Martial who are not necessarily senators[84]. This is true of Decianus, who is prominent in Martial's first two books but absent afterwards, and of Maternus, who was a jurist as well as a lawyer; both are addressed with respect by Martial, unlike Pompeius Auctus, who is treated with irony, and who probably was of lower status[85]. Equally uncertain is the case of Paulus, who is addressed as an influential lawyer in 7.72. The name *Paulus* recurs a number of times, but mostly in skoptic epigrams, where the addressee is fictional[86]. However, in two cases we have an isolated vocative (5.4, 6.12), and here identity with the lawyer is possible, even if no more than that[87].

Housman 1919: 76 = 1972: 3.990, followed by Shackleton Bailey 1990: 491 and 1993: 3.340).

[83] I subjoin a sample of prosopographical problems concerning senatorial addressees. Stertinius Avitus (*suff.* 92) is addressed by Martial in 9.*dedic.* (cf. 9.*ep.*); how many of the *Auiti* addressed elsewhere are the same man, if any (cf. p. 41)? Is the senator Licinianus of 1.49 to be identified with the Lucius of 4.55 and is he the Valerius Licinianus of Plin. *Ep.* 4.11 (cf. Howell 1980: 214)? How many of the *Seueri* addressed by Martial are Silius Severus, the son of Silius Italicus (cf. above, p. 41)? Is the Macer of 10.18 (17), *curator uiae Appiae*, the same as the Macer of 10.78, legate of Dalmatia (cf. Eck 1982: 331, n. 199, *PIR*^{2} M 12–14)? Are the *Galli* of 1.108 and 3.92 Munatius Gallus, legate of Numidia in 100–103, who is addressed in 10.33 (cf. *PIR*^{2} M 724 = 725, Eck 1982: 334, 1983: 186–87 with n. 476)? Is Atticus (7.32, 9.99.1) a son of Vestinus Atticus (*cos.* 65) and Statilia Messalina (Balland 1998: 60–63)?

[84] On advocacy, which was open to men of all ranks, see L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.181–85. Other senatorial lawyers in Martial are Pliny (10.20 [19]) and Restitutus (10.87), if he is identical with the Claudius Restitutus of Plin. *Ep.* 3.9.16.

[85] Decianus is praised as a lawyer in 2.5. Maternus is addressed as a lawyer and jurist in 10.37; if he had indeed the *ius respondendi* (L. Friedländer 1886: 2.129), he probably was a senator; cf. Kunkel 1952: 271–89. On Pompeius Auctus cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 1.499.

[86] One of these epigrams, 12.69, was interpreted in a laudatory sense by Housman 1907: 263 = 1972: 2.737, but cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 148.

[87] Sherwin-White 1966: 641 identifies Paulus with the Velius of 9.31 and with the Velius Paulus mentioned as proconsul of Bithynia-Pontus around 79/80 at Plin. *Ep.* 10.58.3 (but note Eck 1982: 303, n. 89, who considers the possibility that the proconsul's name was Vettius, not Velius). However, Martial's Velius is much more likely to have been C. Velius Rufus, an equestrian military man (Pflaum 1960–61: 1.114–17), although this is not certain (Strobel 1986b: 265–66, n. 3).

Martial's close friend Julius Martialis may also have been a lawyer, but he will be discussed at the end of this section.

If we pass to equestrian addressees, we may start with someone who may have been senatorial: the military man Marcellinus, who was posted with the army in the North and later in the East[88]. Among the certain equestrians, three attained to the highest pinnacles of the *cursus*[89]: Norbanus, who as governor of Raetia contributed to the suppression of the revolt of Saturninus in January 89 and was Prefect of the Guard at the time of Domitian's murder in 96[90]; Ti. Claudius Livianus, who was to become Prefect of the Guard under Trajan[91]; and Vibius Maximus—if indeed Martial's addressee is the later Prefect of Egypt[92]. Crispinus, on the other hand, probably never was Prefect of the Guard, but owed his power to his personal influence

---

[88] See *PIR*[2] M 183; the suggestion made there that Marcellinus served in the troops of his own father cannot be reconciled with 6.25. His father very probably was Faustinus (on whom see below): cf. L. Friedländer 1886: 1.286, Syme 1982–83: 251 = *RP* 4.106. Another military man of uncertain rank is Caecilius Secundus, stationed on the Danube in 7.84.

[89] One might add Cornelius Fuscus, who was Prefect of the Guard at the time of his death in the Dacian wars in 86 or 87, but Martial's one poem in his honour (6.76), a fictional inscription for his tomb in Dacia, was written on the occasion of the peace of 89 and is probably to be taken as a compliment to Domitian rather than as a sign of a personal relationship between Fuscus and Martial. On the career see Pflaum 1960–61: 1.77–80.

[90] 9.84, quoted at p. 77. In the older literature Norbanus was conflated with his fellow suppresser of the Saturninian revolt, the consular A. Bucius Lappius Maximus (as the correct name is, not L. Appius Maximus); the confusion was finally dispelled by Nesselhauf 1960: 165, n. 22 (on Norbanus) and—independently—by Assa 1964 (on Lappius). The new view is accepted in *PIR*[2] L 84 and N 162, *RE* S 14 (1974) s.v. "Norbanus (1a)", Pflaum 1982: 17–18, and elsewhere, but is often wholly or partly ignored by expounders of Martial (e.g. Sullivan 1991: 35, Shackleton Bailey 1990: 307 [with 513] and 1993: 2.304); the new commentary on Book 9 by Henriksén, however, is correct (1998–99: 2.112).

[91] Livianus is not mentioned by name, but 9.103 celebrates the slave twins Hierus and Asylus, who on the evidence of an inscription (*CIL* 6.280) belonged to him; see Huelsen 1889 and *PIR*[2] C 913.

[92] 11.106. On the vexed question of the identity of the various (Vibii) Maximi attested at this period see the lucid exposition by Syme 1985a: 326–33 = *RP* 5: 442–49. The Maximus of 1.7 and 1.69 was interested in poetry and poets, which the Vibius Maximus of 11.106 was not: so we have a different person (White 1973c). On the identity of the Maximi of 5.70, 7.73 and 10.77 nothing can be said. All other Maximi are fictional. On Statius' Vibius Maximus see p. 221.

with Domitian[93]. To these equestrian addressees may be added a certain Sextus, who seems to have been Domitian's *a bibliothecis*, i.e. in charge of the imperial libraries[94].

Crispinus and Sextus were used by Martial as "brokers", i.e. as persons who served him with their contacts, in this case their contacts with the emperor. Other brokers with the emperor were leading imperial freedmen[95]. Martial often addresses Domitian's *a cubiculo* ("chief chamberlain"), Parthenius, and once his *tricliniarcha* ("chief steward"), Euphemus. Entellus, who was *a libellis*, i.e. in charge of petitions, is not addressed as a broker, but it may be assumed that he too, functioned as one. Finally, Martial, like Statius, celebrates the first cutting of the locks of Earinus, a cupbearer and favourite of Domitian.

But not all of Martial's addressees pursued a career, whether as senator, knight or imperial freedman. There were also those persons one might call "gentlemen of leisure": members of the senatorial and (especially) the equestrian order, who—for whatever reasons—had foregone a career and devoted themselves to more private occupations. A probable representative of this type is one of Martial's most frequent addressees, Faustinus, who receives nineteen epigrams, but is never praised for any kind of oratorical, political, or military activity; what does receive attention is his literary production and his life of cultured leisure at his villas, of which four are individually praised[96]. However, because Martial sometimes addresses a politi-

---

93 See Courtney 1980: 207, Vassileiou 1984, B.W. Jones 1992: 69–70.

94 See p. 343.

95 On these see pp. 345–349.

96 Literary production: 1.25; cf. 6.61 (60). Villas: 3.58 (a *uilla rustica* at Baiae; cf. 3.47); 4.57, 5.71, 7.80 (Tibur); 5.71 (Trebula); 10.51 (Anxur; but cf. n. 98). Citroni 1975: 86 and Howell 1980: 161 still consider it possible that Martial's Faustinus is the same as the Faustinus who is mentioned in the epigram found in the "grotta di Tiberio" at Sperlonga (*AE* 1967, 85 = 49 Courtney 1995), and Tandoi 1988 (written in 1969) even used the identification for wide-ranging speculations (as does, in a different manner, Hampe 1972, esp. 45–57), but it is now generally agreed that the Sperlonga epigram is much later: see Leppert 1978, Riemann 1980: 377 with n. 96, and Courtney 1995: 272. Recently, Bowersock 1994: 37–38 has revived the old identification (Hallström 1910) of Martial's Faustinus with the Faustinus addressed by Antonius Diogenes in his *Wonders beyond Thule* (cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 166, 111a.32–33); he has been seconded by Stramaglia 1999: 97–98, who connects this

cian without paying explicit attention to his career, it cannot be quite excluded that Faustinus was a politician after all; in that case he might be identified with Cn. Minicius Faustinus (*suff.* 91)[97]. If on the other hand he was indeed a "gentleman of leisure", the word "leisure", which is a good summary of the impression conveyed by Martial, may nevertheless not be quite adequate to the underlying reality, of which poem 10.51 perhaps gives a glimpse: Faustinus longs to leave for his villa at Anxur (Terracina), but is kept in Rome by occupations which leave him "tired" (15)[98]. When these occupations were not political, they were conceivably of a commercial kind: that would be in line both with Faustinus' wealth and with Martial's reticence about his activities—for commerce was not something openly to be boasted of by those who wished to be counted among the happy few[99].

This type of person is frequent in Statius' *Silvae*, and it is not surprising that three of the six addressees Martial shares with Statius can be assigned to it: Atedius Melior, the splendid host, Claudius Etruscus, the owner of luxurious baths, and Novius Vindex, the *collectionneur* of precious *objets d'art*[100]. Other representatives of the type in Martial include Castricus, who is complimented as the owner

---

hypothesis with the speculations of Tandoi. But even if Antonius Diogenes should indeed have written under Domitian (rather than in the second century), the identification is far from compelling: Faustinus was a common *cognomen* (Kajanto 1965: 272), and there is no evidence that Antonius Diogenes ever went to Rome or Martial's Faustinus to the Greek East, or more specifically to Aphrodisias, where Antonius Diogenes may have been based (Bowersock 1994: 38–40).

[97] Cf. p. 161. Syme 1982–83: 254 = *RP* 4.106 states that Faustinus "does not look like a senator", presumably because "through the years Faustinus is discovered only once at Rome (X 51)", but in many poems the place of residence is not specified and could be Rome.

[98] Damon 1997: 162, n. 37, suggests that *Faustine* (5) in this poem is an error for *Frontine* (cf. 10.58); if so, the poems for Faustinus would look even more homogeneous. On the other hand, it would not be possible to refer this poem to Frontinus' consulate in 98, because there seems to be a laudatory reference to the *Templum Gentis Flauiae* (14), which dates the poem to before the death of Domitian in 96. Moreover, Frontinus' consulate fell in January (cf. Plin. *Pan.* 61.6), whereas the poem is from May (1–2).

[99] On this theme see p. 310.

[100] They are more fully discussed in the chapters on Statius; see esp. pp. 226–229.

of a villa and as a poet, and someone mentioned only with his *praenomen*, Publius, who is teased as something of a dandy[101].

Somewhat less certain is the case of Flaccus (who has already been discussed) and Terentius Priscus; both occur together in 8.45, where Terentius Priscus' safe return from Sicily prompts Martial to express his hope that Flaccus too will return unharmed—he from Cyprus (cf. 9.90). Although it cannot be excluded that these journeys were undertaken in official mission[102], it is quite conceivable that Flaccus and Priscus travelled on business. We have seen that Flaccus was associated in Martial's mind with Maecenas; the same holds for Priscus. After his return to Spain, Martial proclaims that he has finally found his Maecenas in Terentius Priscus, adding that now, after Domitian's death, it is safe to be generous, but that Priscus had already supported him under the tyranny (12.3 [4 + 6.7–12])[103]. Indeed, in the earlier books there are a number of poems addressed to a Priscus, in one of which we hear of literary interests—it is a plausible guess that we are dealing with Terentius Priscus throughout[104]. A third person to be associated with Maecenas by Martial is Voconius Victor, who is praised as the famous author of verses on his beloved

---

[101] He is identified by Balland 1998: 53–59 with the young Hadrian, who however appears too young: at the time of 2.57, e.g., where Publius' taste in mantles is mentioned (3), Hadrian was only around ten years old.

[102] Eck 1983 conjectures that Flaccus may have been a quaestor or a proconsular legate (193, n. 522) and Terentius Priscus a proconsul (203, n. 579); Howell 1980: 242 and Henriksén 1998–99: 1.172 and 2.130–31, both following the unpublished dissertation of P. White, think that Flaccus went to Cyprus as a proconsul. Cf. above, n. 63.

[103] That the lines traditionally numbered 12.6.7–12 belong with 12.4 (in the traditional numbering) was proved by Immisch 1911 and has been accepted in all editions published since then.

[104] The Priscus of 9.77 wrote a book on the question *Quod optimum sit ... conuiuium* (1), a theme dear to Plutarch (the author of nine books of *Quaestiones convivales*), who dedicated his *De oraculorum defectu* to a Terentius Priscus (409d), probably the same person (Dessau 1911: 160, n. 2). The Priscus of 6.18 had Spanish contacts, and is therefore also to be identified with Terentius; the other (real) Prisci occur at 7.46, 8.12, and 10.3. Immisch 1911: 501–03 distinguishes epigrams to Terentius Priscus the father from epigrams to Terentius Priscus the son, but his chronological arguments are not conclusive, and I prefer to believe (with C.P. Jones 1971: 60, n. 74) that Martial addresses only one Terentius Priscus, and (with Shackleton Bailey 1993: 320–21) that the *pater* of 12.62.14 is this Terentius Priscus himself.

boy Thestylus (7.29). He may be identical with the Voconius whose lascivious poetry was commemorated by Hadrian in a funerary epigram, and who is called an *amicus* of that emperor by Apuleius (*Apol.* 11)[105]; if so, we have another indication that he belonged to the upper class.

After his return to Spain, Martial was supported not only by Terentius Priscus, but also by Marcella, a wealthy and cultured woman; she was rich enough to provide the poet with a small estate, and she appreciated being complimented on the urbanity of her conversation[106]. Marcella belonged to the provincial upper-class, but in the capital, too, there were educated ladies who took an interest in poets[107]. Martial associated with at least two of them who were well-connected: Mummia Nigrina, whom he praises for sharing her inherited wealth with her husband, the senator Antistius Rusticus (*suff.* 90), and Argentaria Polla, said to be endowed with "wealth" (*censu*) and "blood" (*sanguine*) by Statius (*Silv.* 2.7.86), and widow of the poet Lucan[108]. Other women addressed by Martial need not have been of high status[109].

In general, quite a few of Martial's addressees seem to have been social equals. We have seen that he addressed the invitation poem 10.48 not only to the patrician Stella and the wealthy Flaccus, but

---

[105] Hadr. fr. 2 (Courtney 1993: 382; *FPL*[3] 344). This Voconius is usually identified (thus by Courtney) with the Voconius Romanus who receives a number of letters from Pliny, but that is unlikely (see Fein 1994: 104–06, Balland 1998: 50 with n. 62). I assume that Voconius Victor, who is mentioned with his full name only in 7.29, is the same as the Victor of 11.78, a ribald wedding poem which picks up the theme of preferring boys over women from 7.29.

[106] 12.21 and 31; the old romantic view, that she became Martial's wife (cf. e.g. Lessing 1973: 481 = 11.270–71 Lachmann–Muncker) is certainly incorrect.

[107] On women as patrons of poets see Hemelrijk 1999: 97–145 (esp. 128–42 on non-imperial women, for whom Martial and Statius provide the only direct evidence)..

[108] Mummia Nigrina: 4.75, 9.30; on her identity and that of her husband see Syme 1983b = *RP* 4.278–94. Argentaria Polla: 7.21–23, 10.64; on her identity see Nisbet 1978, with my discussion at pp. 223–225.

[109] These are: Aratulla, whose brother was exiled on Sardinia (8.32); Sabina in Atesta (10.93; discussed by Hemelrijk 1999: 139–40 as a patroness, although there are no indications of asymmetry); Claudia Rufina, of British descent, who is congratulated on the birth of a child (11.53); cf. also the poetess Sulpicia (10.35 and 38). The Lesbia of 5.68 (if real) will have been a courtesan.

also to four people who seemed to be without strong political or economic assets: Nepos, Canius Rufus, Julius Cerialis and Lupus. Three of Martial's most frequent addressees belong in this category[110].

Q. Ovidius can be compared with Nepos, because he too was a neighbour at Nomentum; like Martial, he owned a vineyard there[111]. In 7.93 Martial complains that Ovidius spends too much time at Narnia (in Umbria), where he may have owned further possessions, but more probably went to visit at the villa of some patron[112]. Ovidius was a man who took social obligations seriously: he followed the consular Caesonius Maximus in exile, and later planned on leaving Nomentum in order to accompany an *amicus* to Britain[113]. As in the case of Martial himself, moderate wealth did not imply exemption from the duties of a client.

Another friend of more or less equal social position was A. Pudens, who appears in 1.31 as a centurion, with the ambition of becoming *primipilus*, the senior centurion of his legion; in 5.48 the promotion has materialised, and a year later, in 6.58, Martial anticipates his return home as a Roman knight[114]. This is in accordance with what we know about the primipilate: it lasted a year and automatically led to the bestowal of equestrian rank; after his period of service the *primipilaris* could either stay on in the emperor's service or take his retirement, upon which he received a fee of 600,000 sesterces (one and a half times the minimum amount necessary to

---

110 There are others less frequently mentioned, such as Juvenal, later to become famous as a satirist, whose life as a client is graphically described in 12.18.

111 13.119, 1.105; cf. 9.98, where *Ouidi* is isolated vocative in a poem on a fraudulent wine-merchant. That he was a good friend of Martial appears from 9.52–53, on his birthday.

112 One wealthy Roman who owned a villa there was Pompeia Celerina, Pliny's mother-in-law (*Ep.* 1.4.1). Citroni 1975: 321 states that Ovidius also owned a Sabine property, but in 10.44.9 *Sabinis* must refer to his Nomentan estate (Nomentum was often considered Sabine: Verg. *A.* 7.712, Strb. 5.3.1, Plin. *Nat.* 3.107). Kleijwegt 1998: 270–72 thinks Ovidius was a patron, who moreover humiliated Martial by not accepting a gift (9.53; but cf. for a more positive reading Henriksén 1998–99: 2.28).

113 Exile with Caesonius Maximus: 7.44–45 (from 44.5 it appears that Maximus was a consular); on the background cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.71, where the manuscripts give the *nomen* as Caesennius. Planned journey to Britain: 10.44, surely this time not to accompany an exile (as Kleijwegt 1998: 272 proposes), but a governor or a legionary legate.

114 The correct interpretation of these poems has been established by Citroni 1982.

qualify as a knight)[115]. This seems to be what Pudens has done, for from Book 7 onwards we find him settled at Rome, pursuing his interest in poetry and boys[116]. In fact, *primipilares* were not the boorish and uncouth "varicose centurions" of the satirical tradition, but respected members of society, some of whom Pliny the Younger counted among his friends—and even the satirist Juvenal did not deny that the primipilate left a man well-off[117].

In the same context Juvenal mentions the pleading of cases (14.192), and this could have been the career pursued by another of Martial's close friends, Julius Martialis (the identical *cognomen* does not indicate kinship). The evidence for this comes in a poem in which Martial imagines a life of *dolce far niente* shared with his friend:

> nec nos atria nec domos potentum
> nec litis tetricas forumque triste
> nossemus nec imagines superbas (5.20.5–7)

> We would know neither the halls nor the houses of the mighty, nor grim lawsuits or the gloomy Forum, nor haughty ancestor busts

Line 6 could refer to practice as a lawyer, but Martial repeatedly declares that he neither is nor wants to be a lawyer[118], so that the reference would have to be to Julius alone. This is difficult to reconcile with the use of the first person plural, and it is more likely that line 6, like lines 5 and 7, refers to the duties of a client: while 5 and 7 must refer to the duty of greeting the patron at the *salutatio*, 6 could refer to the duty of applauding his speeches in the law-courts. This would mean that Julius Martialis too was involved, like Martial, in the tedi-

---

[115] Cf. Dobson 1970 and 1978: 115–27.

[116] Poetry: 7.11, 8.63, 9.81; in the earlier books: 4.29. Boys: 8.63; in the earlier books: 13.69 (with Shackleton Bailey's apparatus), 1.31, 5.48. Martial also knew Pudens' townsman from Sarsina, Caesius Sabinus (7.97), who was a local benefactor, as appears from 9.58 and from inscriptions (cf. *PIR*^{2} C 205). Cf. further *PIR*^{2} P 1069.

[117] The satirical tradition: Pers. 3.77–87, 5.189–91 (*uaricosos centuriones*), Juv. 14.193–98 (197 *locupletem*). Pliny's friends: *Ep.* 6.25, 7.11.4, 10.87. Martial has two epitaphs on centurions: 1.93 (two *primipilares*) and 10.26.

[118] See 1.17, 2.30, 2.90 (to Quintilian); cf. 12.68. Allen a.o. 1969–70: 348, Hardie 1983: 54–55 and others are wrong to suppose that Martial did plead cases; poem 8.17 is no evidence, since the "I" there is clearly fictional.

ous obligations of attending on the powerful[119]. As we have seen, it is no argument against this hypothesis that Julius was a man of some wealth. In 4.64 Martial praises his villa on the Ianiculum[120]: a small property, but exquisitely situated, with a view of Rome, yet undisturbed by the dust and noise of Rome; in 7.17 we learn that it was equipped with a library. Martial's tone in the first poem is admiring, in the second modest, and this might be taken as a sign of asymmetry; moreover Martial calls Julius (by implication) *diues*, a term which he never appropriates for himself[121]. On the other hand, Martial repeatedly testifies to a very affectionate relationship—but we have seen that this does not necessarily imply the absence of asymmetry[122].

Looking back on this survey[123], we may state that many among Martial's addressees had greater financial and/ or political resources, i.e. greater power, than he himself, but that he also addressed many people who had about equal resources (setting aside the resource of poetry). The members of the first group fulfil one criterion for being patrons, the members of the second group fall short of this criterion and therefore cannot be called patrons. This raises the question whether it is really enlightening to distinguish poems for patrons from poems for other addressees, in other words whether patronage is a relevant parameter at all. But to answer that question we have to consider the other two criteria.

---

[119] This is the view of Howell 1980: 141–42, who argued that Julius was a client, but not a lawyer; Howell 1995: 100 suggests that he may have been a lawyer as well as a client (similarly Kleijwegt 1998: 273–75). Citroni 1975: 61–62 (and apparently Sullivan 1991: 17) holds that he was a lawyer, but not a client.

[120] From Martial's topographical indications (esp. 18–24) it appears that the villa was not on the Ianiculum proper (i.e. the Gianicolo), but more to the North, on Monte Mario; see most recently Neumeister 1991: 216–17.

[121] At 4.64.30 Martial compares Julius' villa to that *facti modo diuitis Molorchi*. On Martial not calling himself *diues* see above, p. 54 with n. 47.

[122] This may be illustrated from 1.107, addressed to *Luci carissime Iuli*, who might be the same as Julius Martialis (against Howell 1980: 328): in that poem Martial (jokingly) proposes that his dear friend should emulate Maecenas, so that we find affection combined with asymmetry.

[123] I have not discussed the many cases where the social position of an addressee cannot be determined at all. I list some who occur more than once: Caedicianus, Safronius Rufus, Fabullus, the father of Camonius Rufus (a wealthy man if Sullivan 1991: 31 is right in suggesting that he was Martial's host at Forum Cornelii), Dexter.

Duration

In the preceding section I have focused on persons addressed on more than one occasion, thereby anticipating the criterion of duration. But, as has been explained in the Introduction, one can only speak of patronage if the relationship does not only have a certain duration, but is also of a personal nature. In order to ascertain whether the latter was the case, one would have to examine each relationship as such, but a shortcut can be made by considering the terminology used by Martial. When Martial characterises an addressee as his *amicus* or *sodalis* (or himself as the *amicus* or *sodalis* of his addressee), or when he uses the words *amicitia* or *amare*, or when he calls someone *meus* or *noster* (or is called *meus* by the other), we have an indication of a personal relationship. Such terminology is found for most of the addressees considered in the previous section[124], but not for all of them; the major exceptions are Aquillius Regulus, Silius Italicus, Instanius Rufus, and Terentius Priscus. Martial's relationships with Silius and Regulus will be analysed in Chapter 3, where it will appear that Martial was a regular guest and companion of the latter, but seems to have been less close to the former, although close enough to console him on the death of his son (9.86)[125]. As for Instanius Rufus, it will be argued in Chapter 2 that Martial was a boon companion, and it will be noted in Chapter 3 that 12.95 is a rather obscene jest, which Martial certainly could not have allowed himself if there had not been some degree of intimacy[126]. Terentius Priscus, finally, the "Maecenas" of Book 12, receives

[124] In the order in which they have been discussed: Stella (*meus* at 1.7.1 and 4, 5.11.2, 5.12.7, 6.47.1, 7.14.5. 12.2 [3].10), Flaccus (*meus* at 7.87.1), Fuscus (Martial wishes to become his *amicus* and *sodalis* at 1.54), Domitius Apollinaris (*meus* at 7.26.1 and 10, *noster* at 7.89.2; Martial is among his *amici* at 10.12.9), Antonius Primus (*amicitia* at 9.99.6, *amicus* at 10.73.1 [see p. 82, n. 157]), Decianus (*amicus* at 1.39.1; 2.*ep.* is addressed *Deciano suo*), Maternus (*noster* at 1.96.2, *sodalis* at 10.37.3), Paulus (he is supposed to call Martial *meus* at 7.72.16), Marcellinus (Martial is his *amicus* at 6.25.3), Norbanus (Martial entertains *amicitia* with him and is his *amicus* at 9.84; cf. below), Faustinus (*noster* at 3.58.1, *amicus* at 4.10.3; Martialis is his *amicus* at 7.80.5), Q. Ovidius (*amicus* at 9.52.6), A. Pudens (*amat* Martial at 7.11.3, *meus* at 8.63.4), Julius Martialis (*sodalis* at 1.15.1 and 12.34.10).

[125] See pp. 149–155.

[126] See pp. 101 and 165.

marks of affections already much earlier, e.g. in 8.45, where Martial shows himself overjoyed at Priscus' return from Sicily. So we can conclude that those relationships which are proved to have been of some duration by the mere fact that Martial wrote poetry on more than one occasion also had a personal character; in any case there is nothing resembling the impersonal relationship between employer and employee[127].

But even if we have poetry from Martial on only one occasion, there may have been a relationship of some duration, because there may have been interactions which did not leave identifiable traces in the books as we have them. Such traces could be of two kinds. In the first place, it evidently happened that Martial offered poetry to a person without mentioning that person; this was the case especially when the function of the poetry did not consist in publicising or memorising the addressee's name. In this way we can explain how in 4.82 Martial could ask Rufus to commend to Venuleius "these books, too" (*Hos quoque ... libellos*: 1), even though there is no epigram addressing Venuleius in any of the previous books (or in any of the following ones, for that matter): Venuleius will earlier have received books from Martial, but these did not contain epigrams which immortalised his name[128].

The second possibility is that the poet rendered services to his patron not by offering manuscripts of poetry, but by participating in sessions of recitation, improvisation, or literary talk, or simply by providing company (as Horace, Virgil, and other literary men accompanied Maecenas on a political mission[129]). Thus, in a poem addressed to Frontinus, Martial recalls how at Frontinus' villa at Anxur (Terracina) "I had leisure to cultivate with you the poetic Muses" (10.58.5–6). Here it is the literary companionship which proves the duration.

But could it not happen that a poet was invited only once, for a single visit, serving a single, specific purpose? We might seem to have an example of this in 9.43–44, a pair of epigrams celebrating a

---

[127] Cf. Introduction, p. 22.

[128] Venuleius probably is L. Venuleius Montanus Apronianus (*suff.* 92); cf. Syme 1980a: 40–41, 57.

[129] Cf. Hor. *S.* 1.5. On companionship as a service provided by poets see White 1993: 23–25.

statuette representing Hercules, newly acquired by Novius Vindex, who is not addressed elsewhere in Martial[130]; because Statius too describes the statuette, in terms very similar to Martial's[131], it looks as if Vindex had simply invited a number of poets for the purpose of getting his acquisition publicised, without having necessarily cared for these poets beforehand or intending to protect them in the future. But Statius speaks of Vindex as a friend[132], and Martial, too, may have known him for some time when he celebrated the statuette[133]. Already in Book 4 he had written about the death, and more particularly about the testament, of a certain Vestinus, who is probably to be identified with a friend of Vindex of that name, mentioned by Statius[134]. And even though testaments were favourite topics of gossip[135], it would be anomalous if Martial used an epigram merely to report the talk of the town: more probably, he wrote to please one of Vestinus' friends, perhaps Vindex.

Sometimes an addressee is mentioned in only one of Martial's epigrams, but is nevertheless termed *amicus*, *sodalis*, *meus* or the like[136]. The most interesting example is the only epigram mentioning Norbanus, one of the suppressers of the revolt of Saturninus:

---

[130] The Novius of 1.86 is poor and for that reason cannot be identified with Vindex (Howell 1980: 290–91 is right against Citroni 1975: 267); the Novius who is seen playing the *ludus latrunculorum* in 7.72.7–8 might be Vindex, but he is incidentally mentioned, not addressed.

[131] *Silv.* 4.6; see pp. 102 and 256.

[132] Statius calls Vindex *noster* and talks of the *honorem quem de me ... meretur* (*Silv.* 4.*ep.*13–15); cf. also 4.6.12 (*uerus amor* reigning at Vindex' board).

[133] In Shackleton Bailey's text of Mart. 9.43, with the humanist conjecture *Alcides modo Vindicem rogabam* in 1, the phrase *risit, nam solet hoc* in 3 would refer to Vindex, and would constitute a sure indication of familiarity. But Kershaw 1997 and Henriksén 1998: I.212–13 seem right in defending *Alciden modo Vindicis rogabam* (the reading of one branch of the manuscripts, while the other has *Alciden .. Vindicem*). One may compare Tull. Gem. 7 *GP* = *APl.* 103, in which another Lysippan statue of Hercules answers the poet's questions.

[134] Mart. 4.73; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.93–95 with Coleman 1988: 192, and see below, p. 229.

[135] For public discussion of wills cf. Plin. *Ep.* 7.24 and 8.18 and see Champlin 1991: 18–21.

[136] Cf., apart from Norbanus, to be discussed in the text: Fronto (1.55; Martialis is *tuus* at 1), Caecilius Secundus (only at 7.84, if he is not identical with the Secundus

Cum tua sacrilegos contra, Norbane, furores
staret pro domino Caesare sancta fides,
haec ego Pieria ludebam tutus in umbra,
ille tuae cultor notus amicitiae.
Me tibi Vindelicis Raetus narrabat in oris
nescia nec nostri nominis Arctos erat:
o quotiens ueterem non infitiatus amicum
dixisti: "Meus est iste poeta, meus!"
Omne tibi nostrum quod bis trieteride iuncta
ante dabat lector, nunc dabit auctor opus. (9.84)

When against sacrilegious frenzy your pious loyalty, Norbanus, was standing firm for Lord Caesar, I toyed with these verses, safe in the Muses' shade, I, that noted cultivator of your friendship. (5) The Raetian in the land of the Vindelici told you about me, and the North was conversant with my name. O, how often you acknowledged your old friend and said: "He is mine, that poet, mine!" All my work that these past six years you used to get from a reader, you will now get from the author.

Martial claims to be an "old friend" (*uetus amicus*), even "that noted cultivator of your friendship (*amicitia*)", which is surprising in view of the absence of Norbanus' name from Martial's published epigrams before or since. Also, the relationship cannot have been all that intensive, because in the six years that Norbanus had been away on duty, Martial had not kept up the contact, resuming it only when Norbanus was returning to Rome to become Prefect of the Guard[137]. Martial glosses over his embarrassing negligence with a pleasing fancy: trusting in the wide dissemination of his books, he imagines that whenever a *lector* read popular poetry to Norbanus, the latter would promptly acknowledge that these verses were the work of "his own poet", his "old friend" Martial[138]. The reality must have been less flattering, but Martial cannot have appealed to a connection that

of 5.80; *meus* at 1, *sodalis* at 5), Cerrinus (8.18; Martial is his *amicus* at 3 [and cf.9]), Arcanus (8.72; *amicus* at 8), Flavus (10.104; *noster* at 1).

[137] Book 9 is from 94 or 95, Norbanus was certainly Prefect of the Guard in 96 (D. C. 67.15.2), so that the appointment seems to have been the reason for his return.

[138] Shackleton Bailey 1990: 307 and 1993: 2.305, n. *e* states that the *lector* is someone who had sent the books from Rome, whereas Henriksén 1998–99: 2.115 thinks of a "brother in arms" who had taken them with him, but it is more natural to connect the *lector* with the inhabitants of the North, mentioned at 5–6, who recited Martial's verses to Norbanus.

had not existed at all: that would have made him liable to refutation and ridicule. So some kind of *amicitia* there must have been, and the claims to be derived from that must have been strong enough to bridge a gap of no less than six years.

We may be reminded of Pliny, who is likewise addressed only once in Martial, but nevertheless spoke of *amicitia*, and in the name of that *amicitia* wrote an obituary of Martial about six years after he had received the epigram[139]. Pliny conceived of his *amicitia* with Martial as an exchange of gifts, and that leads to the third criterion of patronage.

Reciprocity

No other poet in Graeco-Roman Antiquity talks so often and so openly about the exchange of money, goods, and services as does Martial[140]. As always, it is important to distinguish between poems with real and poems with fictional addressees. I will begin with the former category, dealing first with poems about gifts *given* by Martial, then with poems about gifts *received* by him.

There are about a dozen epigrams which were written to accompany material (i.e. non-poetic) gifts from Martial[141]. In a few cases the recipients are not named, otherwise they mostly belong to Martial's most frequent contacts, especially to those of high status, such as Regulus, Stella, and Flaccus. But we also find Martial's social equal Juvenal, who receives the traditional present of nuts for the Saturnalia (7.91). The gifts to the other recipients are hardly more substantial: Regulus receives incense and a book on one occasion (1.111) and foodstuffs on another (7.31), Flaccus gets cheap cups (12.74), and Stella earthenware (5.59). These are not gifts which are very valuable in themselves; often they are sent on ritualised occa-

---

[139] The only epigram in which Martial addresses Pliny, 10.20 (19), must have been written between 95 and 98, Pliny's obituary, *Ep.* 3.21, between 101 and 104 (see above, n. 1). The Secundus of 5.80 could conceivably be Pliny (the passion for the *lima* [13] would fit), but that epigram is addressed to Severus.

[140] For some general comments, treating the epigrams mainly as comments on the ethics of gift-giving, cf. Spisak 1998.

[141] 1.111, 2.85, 4.19, 5.59, 7.31, 7.49, 7.89, 7.91, 9.54, 9.60, 10.94, 12.74.

sions for gift-giving such as the Saturnalia[142]. Basically, they are compliments, made the more agreeable by the pleasant verses which accompany them; their function is to maintain the relationship and at the same time to symbolise it[143]. In that respect, the very lack of material value of Martial's gifts is part of their message, symbolising his comparative poverty. This message is often articulated in the accompanying poetry. Thus, when Martial is sending foodstuffs to Regulus, he emphasises that they are not from his Nomentan farm, which he presents as sterile; when sending cheap cups to Flaccus, he draws a contrast with the crystal goblets Flaccus imports from Egypt; and when sending earthenware to Stella, he writes:

> Quod non argentum, quod non tibi mittimus aurum,
>   hoc facimus causa, Stella diserte, tua.
> Quisquis magna dedit, uoluit sibi magna remitti;
>   fictilibus nostris exoneratus eris. (5.59)

> If I do not send you silver and do not send you gold, I do so, eloquent Stella, for your own sake. People who give much, want to receive much in return. By my earthenware you shall be acquitted.

This draws attention to another function of gifts: that of serving as a "hook", as Martial puts it elsewhere (5.18.7). The size of a gift sets a standard for the exchange. Here, Martial unexpectedly disclaims interest in a large return, affecting a wish to spare Stella the expense. By a witty paradox, he symbolises the strength of his friendship by the smallness of his gift[144].

Much more frequent than material gifts are gifts of collections of Martial's own poetry. Whether these collections were published books or informal manuscripts will be discussed in Chapter 2, what value they had for their recipients in Chapter 3. Here I limit myself to two observations. First, the great majority of Martial's real addressees were recipients of epigrams accompanying collections of his own

---

[142] At least 2.85, 4.19, 7.91 accompany gifts sent for the Saturnalia (cf. 5.18). 9.54 was sent on the *cara cognatio* (cf. 9.55), 7.89 perhaps on a (return of a) wedding (see p. 160 with n. 51).

[143] On the various types and functions of gifts see Veyne 1976: 74–84 and Baudy 1987.

[144] Less wittily, in 9.55 Martial explains to Stella and Flaccus that he has sent them nothing on the *cara cognatio* in order not to offend others who could also claim a gift from him.

poetry[145]. Secondly, these collections were often explicitly described by Martial as *dona*, *munera*, etc.[146], and, like the non-poetic gifts, were regularly offered by him on institutionalised occasions for gift-giving, such as the Saturnalia[147]. So on the one hand Martial's gifts of poetry were part of his general gift-giving, on the other hand his gift-giving had a special character, because his most frequent and important gifts were poems.

When we look at gifts received by Martial, we find a similar picture. The receipt of gifts is acknowledged in no more than some eight poems addressed to real addressees. Twice Martial receives foodstuffs from persons with (presumably) about equal or smaller material resources (7.27, 9.72), otherwise rather valuable gifts from persons with greater resources: togas from the imperial chamberlain Parthenius (8.28; cf. 9.49) and from the retired general Antonius Primus (10.73)[148], roof-tiles from patrician Stella (7.36), a precious silver bowl from the senatorial politician Instanius Rufus (8.50 [51]), and a chaise from Aelianus, who cannot be identified with certainty, but may well have been another senatorial politician (12.24)[149]; when back in Spain, Martial thanks Terentius Priscus for generosity in general (12.3 [4]) and Marcella for a small estate (12.31). If this amounted to a complete inventory of the gifts received by Martial, there would be scant reason to attach much importance to exchange, especially since in only one of these poems (12.3 [4]) there is an explicit indication that the gifts were offered as a reward for or an incentive to writing. But Martial's poetry books were not his account-books. Even if the genre of the epigram allows him greater freedom to speak of the material aspects of patronage than Statius' more formal *Silvae*, where these aspects are hardly ever men-

---

[145] There is a full list of the relevant epigrams in Citroni 1988: 33, n. 54 = 1996: 55, n. 56; forty-odd addressees are represented.

[146] *Dona*: 7.84, 9.58; *munera*, etc.: 1.111, 3.2, 4.10, 7.17, 7.42, 7.80; cf. also 9.99. Often Martial simply uses the verb *dare*: 1.111, 7.26, 7.42, etc.

[147] 4.14, 5.30, 7.28, 10.18 (17), 11.15, 12.62. The collection accompanied by 10.87 was sent on a birthday (cf. p. 105 with n. 56).

[148] Shackleton Bailey (1990 and 1993) identifies the giver in 10.73 as a M. Severus, but see below, p. 82, n. 157.

[149] On the identification with L. Roscius Aelianus Maecius Celer (*suff.* 100) see Syme 1982–83: 243 = *RP* 4.96 (and 1985c: 194 = *RP* 5.642).

tioned[150], Martial too was bound by rules of tact, politeness, and convention. Thus, he never acknowledges cash gifts, although Pliny's letter is evidence enough that he did receive them[151].

Moreover, if we take into account the epigrams to fictional addressees, we recognise that cash gifts and other money benefits were an important part of exchange in everyday life. Martial's "I" only once acknowledges receipt of a cash gift, and there the amount is only HS 6,000 (4.76), but expectations run as high as HS 200,000 (5.82)[152]; in another poem (4.61), a fictional addressee boasts of having actually received HS 200,000. A special kind of large cash gift was help towards meeting the equestrian census of HS 400,000; although Martial himself stood in no need of this, he regularly complains that the practice has gone out of fashion[153]. Loans may also be included under cash gifts, especially because it was not self-evident that they would be paid back; the amounts involved vary from HS 5,000 to HS 400,000, with four cases of HS 100,000[154]. Inheritances and legacies, finally, were an important type of money benefit. In this case, there can of course be no complaints to an addressee for having given too little, but a few poems go as far as asking an addressee to die soon[155], and many comment on the *captatio*, i.e. the "hunting" of inheritances and legacies, by third parties[156]; Martial presents one person (the same one who boasted of having received a

---

[150] See pp. 240–244.

[151] Cf. further below, p. 81

[152] See further 2.24, 4.37, 7.92, 9.46, 10.11, 12.53.

[153] See 14.122, 4.67 (the amount involved specified as HS 100,000), 5.19, 5.25. In 12.3 (4 + 6.7–12) Martial flatters Nerva by stating that the practice has been resumed.

[154] On (not) paying back: 1.75, 2.3, 3.41 (40), 6.5, 6.30, 8.9, 8.37, 11.76; further requests for (or comments on) loans: 2.30, 2.44, 4.15 ("I" the lender), 6.20, 7.92, 9.102, 10.15 (14), 10.19 (18), 11.76, 12.25.

[155] See 5.39, 11.67, 12.40, 12.73, and cf. 10.97. In 9.48 "I" is after an inheritance without specifying a wish for the death of the testator.

[156] A full list of passages on *captatio* in ancient authors is given by Champlin 1991: 201–02 (but subtract Mart. 3.52, 5.18, 6.27, 12.56, and add 2.76, 10.97, 11.67). In his discussion of the phenomenon (87–102) Champlin rightly stresses that the object of the "hunting" was usually the whole inheritance, so that it is inaccurate to speak of "legacy hunting", although sometimes the stake did consist in a legacy, as at Mart. 2.76 (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1989: 133) and 9.8 (9), and in the stories about Regulus told by Plin. *Ep.* 2.20.

cash gift of HS 200,000) as claiming to have received inheritances of HS 300,000, HS 100,000 and again HS 100,000 in the course of only two days (4.61.9–12).

In none of the epigrams to fictional addressees are there any references to poetry; therefore, they have to be taken as commenting on gift-giving in general, not on rewards for poetry in particular. But sometimes there is a trace that the support Martial received was indeed motivated, at least in part, by the poetry which was his main gift to his real addressees. Thus in 10.73 Martial bestows fulsome praise on a toga sent to him by M. Antonius Primus[157], and adds that even more welcome than the gift was "the judgement of this learned man" (10), where "judgement" (*iudicium*) cannot refer to anything but *literary* judgement. Moreover, the epigram deliberately echoes a slightly earlier epigram (9.99), with which Martial had accompanied the gift of a book of his poetry to Antonius[158]. So it looks as if the toga was sent to Martial in exchange for the book. Of course a toga is nothing different from what other *amici* receive, but that in itself does not tell against the literary character of the exchange: poets, too, need togas[159].

In a number of poems Martial offers more general reflections on the rewards he thinks are due to poetry in general and to his own poetry in particular[160]. These reflections repeatedly turn to the paradigmatic figure of Maecenas, and it will be worth while to consider in some detail how Martial applies the paradigm to his own situation. The first poem where he does so is 1.107, to a L. Julius (perhaps Julius Martialis), who is represented as challenging Martial to write "something big" (2). The poet retorts:

---

157 Martial gives only the *praenomen* of the giver: *Marce* (8). Shackleton Bailey (1990 and 1993) reads the Renaissance conjecture *Seuere* in 2, thus creating a M. Severus. But the connections with 9.99 (see the following note) clearly establish that the giver is Antonius Primus, whose *praenomen* is also given as *Marcus* at 9.99.1 and 3 and at 10.32.3. On the man, see above, p. 64, n. 82.

158 The gift (in 9.99 the book, in 10.73 the toga) is a *pignus amici* (10.73.1) or *pignus amicitiae* (9.99.6), which would have been *uilior* (10.73.5) or *uilis* (9.99.7) if it had been sent by another. Cf. also the references to a letter from the addressee (10.73.1 ~ 9.99.2) and to his favourable opinion of Martial's verse (10.73.10 ~ 9.99.1).

159 Cf. Introduction, p. 26 with n. 84.

160 See, apart from the poems discussed below, 1.76, 3.38, 5.36, 5.56, 9.73, 10.76.

Otia da nobis, sed qualia fecerat olim
  Maecenas Flacco Vergilioque suo.
Condere uicturas temptem per saecula curas
  et nomen flammis eripuisse meum. (1.107.3–6)

Give me leisure—I mean such leisure as Maecenas once provided for his Horace and his Virgil. Then I would attempt to create compositions that would survive through the ages and to snatch my name from the pyre.

There is a clear allusion to Tityrus' words in Virgil's first eclogue: "a god provided me with this leisure (*otia*)" (6). Martial must have interpreted Tityrus as Virgil and the "god" as Octavian, so the question is where Maecenas comes in. The answer is that already before Martial there existed a tradition according to which it was Maecenas who introduced Virgil to Octavian, with the result that Virgil obtained the leisure to abandon his bucolic poetry (as Tityrus in the first eclogue does not) and to undertake the more ambitious genres of didactic and heroic epic[161]. Martial takes up this tradition, paralleling Virgil's pastoral with his own branch of "minor" poetry, although it must remain open how genuine was his wish to write something in a "major" genre. When he returns to the theme in 8.55 (56), he significantly changes the point.

The addressee is wealthy Flaccus, who is presumed to wonder why there are no more Virgils. Martial answers:

Sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones
  Vergiliumque tibi uel tua rura dabunt.
Iugera perdiderat miserae uicina Cremonae
  flebat et abductas Tityrus aeger oues:
risit Tuscus eques paupertatemque malignam
  reppulit et celeri iussit abire fuga.

[161] See *Laus Pis.* 230–37 and Calp. *Ecl.* 4.157–63 (in the latter passage Maecenas is not mentioned, but the parallels with the *Laus Pisonis* suggest that he is meant). On the allegorical interpretation of Virgil in Calpurnius and Martial cf. E.A. Schmidt 1972: 122–27. Calpurnius would have to be eliminated as a precursor of Martial if Champlin and others are right in dating him to the third century (see e.g. Champlin 1978 and 1986, Armstrong 1986, Courtney 1987: 151–56, but against e.g. Townend 1980, Wiseman 1982b, Krautter 1992, Fugmann 1992). On the other hand, the *Laus Pisonis* is secure, because the identification of the addressee of the *Laus Pisonis* with the Neronian conspirator still stands (see Reeve 1984 and Champlin 1989). That Martial knew the work is shown by the echo of 41 in 7.63.7.

"Accipe diuitias et uatum maximus esto;
tu licet et nostrum" dixit "Alexin ames". (8.55 [56].5–12)

(5) Let there be such as Maecenas, Flaccus, then such as Maro will not be lacking: yes, your own lands will give you a Virgil. Tityrus had lost his acres near to unlucky Cremona, and wept in distress at the abduction of his sheep. With a laugh the Tuscan knight dispelled malignant poverty, (10) telling it to retreat in haste. "Here is wealth; now be the greatest poet", he said, " you may even love my slave Alexis".

The phrase "near to unlucky Cremona" (7) is a quotation from Virgil's ninth eclogue (28), where Menalcas is reported to have retrieved confiscated land with the help of his poetry. Menalcas was taken as an allegory for Virgil by Martial's contemporary Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.6.46–47) and apparently by Martial himself, even though at the same time he calls Virgil "Tityrus" on the basis of his allegorical reading of the first eclogue. In the biographical tradition about Virgil, the retrieval of the land is attributed to the help of other patrons, among them Asinius Pollio[162], but Martial wishes to concentrate all the features of a beneficent patron in Maecenas. This can also be observed in his treatment of Alexis, the slave boy passionately desired by Corydon in the second eclogue. In the biographical tradition Alexis is supposed to stand for an Alexander, given to Virgil by Asinius Pollio[163], but in Martial it is Maecenas who made the gift. The effect on Virgil, Martial supposes, was that he gave up the lowly subjects of the *Bucolics*, to become, eventually, the author of the *Aeneid* (17–20)[164]. But Virgil was not the only poet to be enriched by Maecenas:

Quid Varios Marsosque loquar ditataque uatum
nomina, magnus erit quos numerare labor?
Ergo ego Vergilius, si munera Maecenatis
des mihi? Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero. (21–24)

Why should I mention the examples of Varius and Marsus and the names of poets made rich, whom it would be a great labour to enumer-

162 Cf. *Vita Donati* 19 (from Suetonius) and *Vita Probi*; but *Vita Donati* 63 and *Vita Servii* include Maecenas.

163 See *Vita Donati* 9 (not certainly from Suetonius), Servius on *Ecl.* 2.1 and 15, Apul. *Apol.* 10. In Martial, Alexis appears as Virgil's beloved also at 5.16, 6.68, 7.29, 8.63, 8.73; cf. Calp. *Ecl.* 4.73–75 and perhaps Juv. 7.69.

164 On these lines see Housman 1919: 74 = 1972: 3.988–89.

ate? I then, shall I be a Virgil, if you were to give me the gifts of a Maecenas? No, not a Virgil, but a Marsus.

Surprisingly, even with the support of a Maecenas, Martial would not become like Virgil, i.e. an epic poet, but like Domitius Marsus, i.e. an excellent epigrammatist[165].

In a number of other epigrams, Martial rings the changes on these themes. In 5.16, he implicitly asks his reading public for an Alexis, not as an inducement to write epic, but as a reward for his epigrams; the reading public, of course, feigns not to understand. In 8.73 an Alexis would make Martial write "poems that would survive" (4), but unlike in 1.107 (quoted above), the claim of survival is not connected exclusively with the higher genres, since Alexis is here lined up with the women who inspired Catullus and the elegists. On the other hand, in 11.3, when Martial promises to write "pages that will survive" (7) if a Maecenas will support him, he clearly means epic[166]. All these epigrams discuss the nature and value of Martial's poetry, and Maecenas serves more as a focus for poetological reflections than as a norm seriously proposed. Yet in the end Martial did find his Maecenas:

Quod Flacco Varioque fuit summoque Maroni
  Maecenas, atauis regibus ortus eques,
gentibus et populis hoc te mihi, Prisce Terenti,
  fama fuisse loquax chartaque dicet anus. (12.3 [4].1–4)

What Horace, Varius and greatest Virgil had from Maecenas, knight sprung from regal ancestors, I had from you, Terentius Priscus. This all peoples and nations will learn from loquacious fame and papyrus grown old.

This, however, was after Martial had returned to Spain; in Rome there was no Maecenas, there were not even such patrons as Martial

---

[165] Martial voices his admiration for Marsus' epigrams in 1.*ep.*, 2.71, 2.77, 5.5, 7.99; there is the same constellation Maecenas–Virgil–Marsus and comparison of himself with Marsus in 7.29. Against the interpretation that *Marsus ero* means "I will be a *bad* epic poet" (cf. 4.29) see Citroni 1968: 288–89 (and already Housman 1934: 188 = 1972: 1240).

[166] Kay 1985: 62 regards this poem as a *recusatio*, a witty excuse not to write epic in praise of Nerva. But "quiet" Nerva (see p. 64 with n. 77) boasted of no *proelia* (8); moreover, he himself had preferred elegy to epic (8.70).

had still known under Nero. In a poem to a fictional addressee he specifies:

Libras quattuor aut duas amico
algentemque togam breuemque laenam,
interdum aureolos manu crepantis,
possint ducere qui duas Kalendas,
quod nemo nisi tu, Labulle, donas,
non es, crede mihi, bonus. Quid ergo?
Vt uerum loquar, optimus malorum es.
Pisones Senecasque Memmiosque
et Crispos mihi redde, sed priores (12.36.1–10)

You give your friend four pounds of silverware, or only two, and a shivering toga and a short cloak, sometimes gold pieces clattering in the hand, which are enough to cover two months' rent, (5) and you are the only one to do so, Labullus, but believe me, you are not for that reason a good man. You want to know why? To tell the truth, you are the best of the bad. The Pisones, the Senecae, the Memmii, these I would like to have back, and the Crispi—I mean the former ones[167].

The speaker does not in so many words claim to have enjoyed the patronage of these past worthies himself, but in another poem to a fictional addressee (4.40), Martial has his speaker regret the patronage of the Pisones and the Senecae[168]. If we identify that speaker with Martial, we may conclude that in his first period at Rome, he had indeed been supported, if not by other members of the great families he recalls, then at least by C. Calpurnius Piso, the later conspirator, who was noted for his patronage[169], and by the philosopher Seneca, who was a fellow-Spaniard, a fellow-poet, and extremely

[167] In line 10, Shackleton Bailey 1978: 293 = 1997: 90 conjectures *seu* for *sed* and prints it in his editions, but *sed priores* refers back to *Crispos* only, and makes it clear that Martial does not mean any contemporary Crispus (in 10.15 [14] a fictional "Crispus" was a stingy patron). For this use of *sed* in Martial see Citroni 1975: 144.

[168] That the speaker in 12.36 does not claim personal experience of the patrons he mentions is stressed by Kleijwegt 1999: 110–114, who, however, thinks that the speaker in 4.40 cannot be identified with Martial, apparently because that speaker, complaining about his fictional addressee, implicitly admits that he has made a wrong choice of patron in the first place (1998: 265; cf. 1999: 108–10). But the speaker's naïve trust is amplified in order to underscore the enormity of the addressee's treason.

[169] Cf. *Laus Pis.*, Juv. 5.108–112 (with Probus' scholium on 109), Tac. *Ann.* 15.48. See Champlin 1989 for a thorough discussion of this evidence.

wealthy; indeed there are good reasons to assume that Martial's Nomentan estate was a legacy from Seneca[170]. And perhaps Seneca's nephew, the poet Lucan, may be added to the list, because Martial addresses his widow Argentaria Polla as his *regina*, i.e. his patroness (10.64.1)[171]. However that may be, such enlightened patrons firmly belong to the past: nowadays, Martial complains, patrons count themselves generous if they give two or four pounds of silver, a toga, a cloak, or money to pay the rent for two months. So there is patronage, but not as bountiful as Martial would wish, with the consequence that the poet could not limit himself to paying court to one or two very great men. Instead of one Maecenas or Seneca, there are a great many patrons on whose support Martial is dependent.

Initiative

If there was exchange of poetry for support, we would expect, in accordance with what was said in the Introduction[172], that a transaction could be initiated by the poet as well as by the patron. This is indeed what we find, although the evidence is seldom very firm.

There are only a few texts which specify that Martial is writing on request. In 10.18 (17) he says that Macer "asks" (*petit*: 2) and "demands" (*poscit*: 3) a gift of poetry for the Saturnalia. Stronger language is used in 9.89, where Stella is said to "force" (*cogis*: 2) Martial to write epigrams; the explanation for this vocabulary is that the setting of the poem is a symposium, at which Stella is acting as the

---

170 Seneca had owned large vineyards at Nomentum (Sen. *Ep*. 104.1, 6, 110.1, *Nat*. 3.7.1; Col. 3.3.3; Plin. *Nat*. 14.49–52), Martial's estate produced wine (13.119, 10.48.19), and Martial's neighbour at Nomentum, Q. Ovidius, who also grew wine there (13.119, 1.105, 7.93, 10.44; cf. 9.98), was connected with Seneca (7.44–45). Kleijwegt 1999: 114–16 rejects Seneca as the donor, because Martial describes his estate as not very productive, whereas Seneca's vineyards were a commercial success, but Martial surely received only a small part of Seneca's possessions. He also thinks that Martial would have mentioned Seneca as his benefactor in the same way as he mentions Marcella in 12. 31, but that poem celebrates a recent gift from a living benefactress, whereas Seneca had long been dead.

171 Kleijwegt 1999: 106–07, n. 6 mistakenly glosses *regina* as "patron of the arts", denying its implications for a personal relationship, but cf. above, p. 16, with n. 51.

172 See p. 28.

master of the feast, enforcing a convivial "law" (*Lege*: 1)[173]. A symposiastic background may perhaps also be assumed for 11.42, where Caecilianus "demands" (*poscas*: 1) lively epigrams, but sets lifeless themes. Not individual epigrams, but a whole book is at issue in the letter to Terentius Priscus prefacing Book 12, where Martial states that he has made haste to put the book together, because he did not want to deny Priscus' request (*tibi ... exigenti*: 18). And that is all the explicit evidence on patrons taking the initiative, at least as far as real persons are concerned[174]. But it would be wrong to argue from silence, and conclude that patrons' initiative rarely occurred, because if it did occur, silence is precisely what we would expect: a literary tribute loses much of its force if it appears to have been commanded[175]. So it is very well possible that Martial wrote more poems on request than appears at first sight.

This suspicion can be strengthened by consideration of an interesting complex of circumstantial evidence. Among the occasions celebrated by Martial, there are six which are also honoured by Statius in his *Silvae*—and Statius sometimes provides information on initiative in his epistolary prefaces. In one case he implies that the initiative had been his own: he reminds Melior that he has written his epicedion on the latter's favourite Glaucias (*Silv.* 2.1) "in such a hurry that I had to apologise to your feelings for my swiftness" (2.*ep.*8–9); similarly, Martial may not have waited for a request from Melior to offer him two epigrams in commemoration of Glaucias (6.28–29). In three other cases, Statius specifies patrons' initiative, which thus becomes probable for Martial as well, although each case must be considered individually. In the preface to Book 1, he speaks to Stella of "your epithalamium that you ordered me to write" (*quod mihi iniunxeras*) (21), but we cannot automatically conclude that Martial's poem on Stella's wedding was written to order as well, because that is a teasing epigram (6.21), not at all comparable with Statius' much longer and much more formal composition (*Silv.* 1.2). There is a stronger parallelism between the two poets in their com-

---

173 See p. 100.

174 Mart. 4.17 and 4.31 are jokes on requests by fictional addressees. Requests by real addressees to write "grand" poetry instead of epigrams (e.g. 1.107, 8.73; cf. 8.55 [56]) are in a different category.

175 Cf. p 245 (on Statius).

memorations of Lucan's birthday (*Silv.* 2.7, Mart. 7.21–23), but unfortunately the relevant part of Statius' preface is not clear. However, there seems to have been some kind of ceremony, organised by Lucan's widow, Argentaria Polla, at which she seems to have asked Statius for a poem (2.*ep.*22–24)[176]; if so, it is unlikely that Martial's epigrams were offered spontaneously. There is more clarity in the case of the poems on the locks of Earinus, the imperial favourite: Statius states that his poem (*Silv.* 3.4) was written to comply with a request (*desiderium*) from Earinus (3.*ep.*16–20), and it may be assumed that Martial's elaborate cycle of six epigrams (9.11–13, 16–17, 36) was similarly written to order[177]. In the remaining two cases, the poems on the baths of Claudius Etruscus (*Silv.* 1.5, Mart. 6.42) and on a statuette of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex (*Silv.* 4.6, Mart. 9.43–44), Statius gives no explicit information on initiative, but he boasts that he has composed his poem for Etruscus in the course of a meal (1.*ep.*30), and the main, descriptive part of the poem for Vindex may likewise go back to convivial improvisation, because it was at a meal that Vindex displayed his statuette (4.6.1–34)[178]. It is likely that the poet's performances at both occasions were not spontaneous, but took place at the bidding of the host, and the same may be assumed for Martial's parallel compositions.

But there is little reason to doubt that the poet, too, could take the initiative, not only in offering individual poems (such as congratulations or consolations), but also in offering entire books. This may be illustrated from Book 12, which was composed (as we saw) at the request of Terentius Priscus, but was then sent from Spain to Rome with a dedication to Stella (12.2 [3]).There is little reason to assume that Stella had asked for this or had even been aware that after three years of silence (cf. 12.*ep.*1–2) Martial had again produced a book. But Stella was the obvious dedicatee, because he was consul at the time (12.2 [3].10); moreover he was a poet himself (11–14) and had influence in literary circles, which gave Martial the confidence that he will be able to give the book a wide distribution: "He will give

[176] This is the interpretation given by White 1975: 281–83, who reads F. Skutsch's *coleremus* for the corrupt *consuleremus*.

[177] The conclusion is, however, not certain: see Henriksén 1998–99: 1.92.

[178] See further pp. 102 and 256.

you [the book] to the people, the senators and the knights to read" (15). Patrons could help poets not only by giving them money and other material goods, but also by facilitating the reception of their work. But this type of support is more conveniently discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

MODES OF RECEPTION OF MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

Many of Martial's epigrams were originally written for an occasion: they accompanied a gift, celebrated some event in a patron's life, or contributed to the entertainment at a symposium. It is likely that the poet offered these poems to their addressees at the occasion itself: at least there seems to be no reason why he should have omitted to do so, even if he planned on later publication[1]. So there are two levels at which the epigrams could function: the level of the occasion and the level of the published book. Some epigrams may have been written to function at both levels, others will have been written exclusively for the published book.

But this functioning at two levels, as it were, is a matter of choice, not of necessity, and we may assume that many epigrammatists never aspired to the second level, that of publication. For a long time, Martial seems to have belonged to this category. Although the publication of books of epigrams, even of an *opus* consisting of several books, was an established practice since Hellenistic times[2], it took Martial more than twenty years since his arrival in Rome in 64 before he published the first book of his mixed epigrams around 86 and the second book shortly afterwards (having previously published the so-called *Liber spectaculorum* in 80 and two books with distichs describing Saturnalian presents, the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, in 83 and 84 or in 84 and 85, respectively)[3]. Of course one could suspect that

---

[1] Note that this statement is made about single poems, not about collections.

[2] Publication of books of epigrams is known from the 3rd century B.C.E. onwards; see Fraser 1972: 1.607–08, 2.858–59, Cameron 1993: 3–10, 400, and especially Gutzwiller 1998: 15–46. I may add that book-numbers have been preserved for Lucillius (*AP* 9.572: dedication of his second book to Nero) and for Leonides of Alexandria (7 *FGE* = *AP* 6.328: dedication of his third book to Καῖσαρ, probably Nero or Vespasian) and seem to be already attested for the Hellenistic period (P. Vindob. G40611; cf. Cameron 1993: 10, Gutzwiller 1998: 23–24); so their use is not "strikingly original" in Martial, as claimed by Fowler 1995: 35.

[3] That Martial came to Rome in 64 is deduced from 10.103 and 104, which he wrote in 98, immediately before returning to Spain, and in which he gives the dura-

Martial had started writing mixed epigrams only shortly before 86, but there are a number of indications that he had been circulating such epigrams for a much longer period. One of these indications is that at the time of Book 1 Martial is already firmly established in the literary patronage of a large number of patrons (among whom Stella, Regulus, the brothers Domitii, Faustinus, and Flaccus), which is best explained from the hypothesis that his poetry had already been of service to these patrons. He also testifies that epigrams of his had regularly been read by the emperor[4]. Another indication is that throughout Books 1 and 2, Martial comments on his decision to publish in terms which suggest that he experimented with a new kind of circulation, not that he started circulation as such. An example is the following epigram, placed near the beginning of Book 2:

> I nunc, edere me iube libellos.
> Lectis uix tibi paginis duabus
> spectas eschatocollion, Seuere,
> et longas trahis oscitationes.
> Haec sunt, quae relegente me solebas
> rapta exscribere, sed Vitellianis,
> haec sunt, singula quae sinu ferebas
> per conuiuia cuncta, per theatra;
> haec sunt, aut meliora si qua nescis. (2.6.1–9)

> Come on, tell me to publish my books, if you like. But you have hardly read two pages, when you begin to look at the colophon, Severus, and to yawn extensively. (5) Here are the poems that, as I was reading them out, you used to snatch and copy, in expensive notebooks at that. Here are the poems that singly you used to carry in your pockets and bring to all the dinner-parties, to all the theatres. Here are these poems, and perhaps better ones you don't know yet.

The epigrams that "Severus" took to dinner-parties and theatres are probably not celebratory addresses to patrons, but comico-satirical pieces, such as make up the majority of the epigrams in Martial's published books—and the overwhelming majority in Book 2 itself, where patron-oriented verse is all but absent. Apparently Martial "used" these pieces in providing entertainment to his friends,

---

tion of his stay at Rome as 34 years. On the dates of publication of Martial's books see the Appendix.

[4] See 1.101 and 2.91–92, discussed at pp. 366–367.

who could then "re-use" them at various types of social gatherings. In another introductory epigram to Book 2, Martial tries to show that publication is really continuous with the kind of re-use as practised by Severus. He explains to his book why it should be short:

> Te conuiua leget mixto quincunce, sed ante
> incipiat positus quam tepuisse calix. (2.1.9–10)

> The dinner-guest will read you when the warm water has been mixed with his wine, but before the cup he has put down begins to cool.

Of course the symposiast will not read the book in silence, but will recite it out loud to his drinking companions. The only difference with the situation in which Severus took Martial's epigrams to symposia lies in the length of the recital, which Martial is concerned to represent as still not so long as to be detrimental to the function of providing entertainment.

Here Martial is still defensive about publishing his epigrams. In the later books he becomes increasingly self-confident and repeatedly refers to his wide and devoted readership[5]. Even allowing for exaggeration, it is clear that Martial's published books were indeed a great success with the reading public. This will have been caused in the first place by the comico-satirical epigrams, but it also affected Martial's patron-oriented verse, which now attained a much wider reception. This raises the question what became of the original kind of reception, the reception by a single individual or by a small circle gathered at an occasion. In discussing this question, I will differentiate according to whether the poems were heard or read. I will first deal with poems heard at an oral presentation, then with poems read upon presentation of the text in writing. The latter topic will lead to a consideration of dedication and publication and of the reception of the published books, where the distinction between hearing and reading will have to be made again.

Oral Presentation

In an epigram from the second book, Martial mocks a fictional "Mamercus":

---

[5] See below, pp. 132–133.

Nil recitas et uis, Mamerce, poeta uideri.
Quidquid uis, esto, dummodo nil recites. (2.88)

You recite nothing, and yet, Mamercus, you want to be considered a poet. Be whatever you want, as long as you recite nothing.

The distich only works if we assume that the claim reported in the first verse is a paradox, which Martial in the second verse surprisingly accepts, but in such a way as to ridicule the addressee: if "Mamercus" will mercifully continue to refrain from recitation, then Martial will only too gladly count him a poet, even though it cannot really be that someone is a poet who does not recite[6]. This presupposition is still operative in a much later book:

Cum facias uersus nulla non luce ducenos,
  Vare, nihil recitas. Non sapis atque sapis. (8.20)

Although you make two hundred verses each day, Varus, you recite nothing. You are a fool, but no fool.

The epigram stands in a familiar tradition of the criticism of poets who sacrifice quality to quantity[7]: Varus is a fool to compose at such speed, but he is no fool, because he does not recite the result. The wit of the epigram, however, does not lie in these statements themselves, but in the change made by the addition of the paradoxical "but no fool" (*atque sapis*): without these two words, the behaviour described as foolish would not be Varus' production of so many verses, but his failure to recite from them. Because this is what the poem says until the ending brings a surprise, it must itself be unsurprising. Apparently, composition normally entailed recitation.

Not only Martial, many other writers as well attest to the dominance of recitation in Early Imperial Rome[8]. There were various

---

[6] Cf. 3.44.4, of an obnoxious reciter: *nimis poeta es*. Similarly Plin. *Ep.* 1.13.1 connects a *magnum prouentum poetarum* with an abundance of recitations.

[7] Similar exorbitant figures are satirised by Horace (*S.* 1.4.9–10, 1.10.60–61) and Catullus (22.3–5, 95.3–4). Both allude to Callimachus (esp. fr. 1 and 398 Pf., *Ap.* 105–12), but Martial himself is not a Callimachean: see Citroni 1968: 281–86.

[8] The evidence is collected in Funaioli 1914; for interpretation see also L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.225–30 and Guillemin 1937: 98–100. More recent discussions include Quinn 1982: 83–93, 140–65 (does not cover the post-Augustan age), Salles 1992: 93–110 (with insufficient references to the evidence), Binder 1995, Fantham 1996: 211–2, Valette-Cagnac 1997: 111–41; in these studies the distinction between the various types of recitation is not always sufficiently observed.

types. Pliny the Younger limited himself to reading preliminary drafts of his works (both prose and verse) to small groups of trusted friends, with the professed aim of eliciting their comments and corrections[9]. But the same Pliny also provides ample evidence for the existence of a more formal type, where large audiences were invited to applaud the host's newest literary achievement, whether in history, in drama, or in any of the branches of non-dramatic poetry[10]. Such recitations were social occasions, at which the *amici* of the author were expected not only to attend, but also to give vocal expression to their approval[11]. Rich *littérateurs* had equipped their houses with specially fitted recitation-rooms, *auditoria*, which on occasion they might lend to poorer writers as part of their literary patronage[12].

Among Martial's patrons, it is certain that at least one of them, Arruntius Stella, hosted recitations[13]. This suggests that Martial, too, may have recited in the houses of his wealthy protectors. Epigram could seem a less suitable genre for a long recitation than epic, but Pliny recounts having listened for three days to the *poematia* of young Sentius Augurinus, and quotes a few hendecasyllables in which he himself is praised as the aspiring poet's master (*Ep.* 4.27). Indeed, Pliny had for some time been working on a collection of *hendecasyllabi*, which he admitted could also be called *poematia* (the title chosen by Augurinus) or *epigrammata* (*Ep.* 4.14.8)—for such poems were epigrams, just as Martial's hendecasyllables had

9 See most notably *Ep.* 3.18 and 7.17 on the speeches, 5.3.7–11 and 8.21 on the *uersiculi.*

10 A full list of passages is provided by Sherwin-White 1966: 421.

11 See esp. *Ep.* 1.13, 6.17, and 8.12. Cf. the satirical description at Pers. 1.15–21 (with 81–82).

12 The literary and archaeological evidence on *auditoria* in the houses of the rich is collected and discussed by Tamm 1963, esp. 7–23 and 113–88. Patrons who opened their houses to the recitations of others are mentioned by Sen. *Suas.* 6.27, Mart. 4.6, Plin. *Ep.* 8.12.2, Juv. 1.12–13 and 7.39–47 (and cf. Tac. *Dial.* 9.3). The great Maecenas may well have been such a patron, but the so-called "auditorium Maecenatis" was more probably a dining hall (which may, however, have seen recitations in the course of symposia); see Murray 1985: 43 and further references in M. de Vos, "Horti Maecenatis. 'Auditorium'", *LTUR* 3 (1996), 74–75.

13 See Mart. 4.6. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.50 *docti norunt audire penates* (on Stella's house) may, but need not, imply recitations by others than Stella himself.

been epigrams[14]. Like Augurinus, Pliny recited his epigrams, even though this was considered by some to be a breach of senatorial decorum; in self-defence, he pointed to historical precedent and to the private character of his recitations (*Ep.* 5.3). Martial, of course, had less dignity to lose and was subject to fewer strictures[15].

Moreover, Martial's frequent use of such features as word-play, surprise endings and dialogic structure gave his poetry an extraordinary recitational "fitness"[16]. Yet the presence of such features (which carry an appeal to readers just as well as to listeners) does not in itself prove that the poetry in which they occur was intended for oral performance. Indeed, it must be doubted whether Martial ever held full-dress recitations. Whenever he boasts of his popularity as a poet, he refers not to his hearers, but to his readers[17]. There are only a few passages where he represents himself as reciting, and there the situation seems to be one of informal social exchange rather than performance for large invited audiences: he always recites to one specified person, who sometimes reciprocates by reciting in turn[18]. It is striking that most of the passages in question occur in Books 1 and 2, which means that they date from the time when Martial did not yet publish or had just begun to publish his mixed epigrams. It seems as if recitation lost its importance for Martial after he had started publication on a regular basis.

However, there is some evidence, both circumstantial and internal, that there was one social occasion at which Martial gave oral presentations of his poetry throughout his career. This occasion is the

---

[14] Suet. *Vit. Hor.* 45.1–2 Reiff. quotes hendecasyllabic lines by Maecenas (fr. 3 Courtney [1993: 277–78 = fr. 3 *FPL*^{3} [246]) as from an *epigramma*. Cf. for the history of the term Puelma 1996.

[15] Further evidence for the recitation of epigrams are Martial's poems on plagiarists, who are often accused of reciting Martial's work as their own (1.29.2, 1.38.1–2, 1.52.3, 1.66.12, 12.63.7), although the circumstances of the recitations are never specified.

[16] Cf. Burnikel 1990.

[17] See below, pp. 132–133 (but note 9.81.1: *Lector et auditor nostros probat ... libellos*, on which see p. 138).

[18] See Mart. 1.63, 2.6, 2.71 (fictional addressees) and 7.29 (real addressee); cf. 7.68 and the reference in 1.76.13–14 to *pulpita nostra/ et steriles cathedras*. I leave out of account 14.137 (142), because the "I" there cannot be simply identified with Martial. For informal readings cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 1.16.6.

dinner party or symposium[19]. It was customary to provide the guests with entertainment, the nature of which varied according to the tastes of the host[20]. In one of his letters (9.17), Pliny discusses the practice of some to bring on "buffoons, catamites, and fools" (*scurrae cinaedi moriones*), whose attempts at humour were "impertinent" (*petulans*), "lewd" (*molle*), and "clownish" (*stultum*), respectively. In another letter (1.15) he mentions girls from Gades (Cádiz), who were notorious for their lascivious dances[21]. Although Pliny is careful to appear broad-minded and not to condemn the pleasures of large parts of the Roman elite, he also declares that he himself employs entertainers of a different type: actors (*comoedi*), a lyre-player (*lyristes*), a reader (*lector*)[22]. All three can easily be paralleled from other writers.

Pliny's contemporary Plutarch devotes a chapter (7.8) of his *Convivial Questions* to the topic: "What are the best entertainments (ἀκροάματα) to have at dinner?". He disapproves of tragedy as being too serious, mime as being too coarse, and the Aristophanic Old Comedy as being alternately the one and the other (as well as too difficult), but strongly recommends the refined New Comedy of Menander as ideally suited to the relaxed, but not licentious atmosphere of a civilised symposium[23]. Plutarch also approves of concerts by lyre-players (and flute-players), adding that he prefers the instrumental music to be accompanied by words; he does not specify which words, but presumably he thinks of the songs of love and wine

---

19 I will use the word "symposium" loosely, without prejudice to its Greek or Roman character (cf. Gowers 1993: 29, 162); the Latin words are *cena* and *conuiuium*.

20 Most of the evidence is collected in the handbooks and encyclopaedias, e.g. Mau 1900: 616–18, Blümner 1911: 410–12; see also L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.254–55.

21 On *Gaditanae* cf. Mart. 5.78.26–28, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.71, Juv. 11.162–170 (with Courtney 1980: 510–11 on the text); Mart. 14.203 and 6.71 do not specify the symposium as setting.

22 Mentioned together at *Ep.* 1.15.2 and 9.17.3; also at 9.36.4. In a grimmer key, at *Pan.* 49.8 Pliny contrasts the *obscaena petulantia* of the meals of Domitian with the *liberales ioci* and *studiorum honor* at Trajan's board.

23 Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 711e–712f. On dramatic performances at the symposium see C.P. Jones 1991.

of such poets as Sappho and (pseudo-) Anacreon[24]. Sympotic recitals of non-dramatic and non-lyric poetry by a reader are not discussed by Plutarch, but we find them in Juvenal, who invites a guest to a programme of Homer and Virgil, and in Persius, who satirises the Roman aristocracy for enjoying sentimental mythological compositions when in their cups[25].

This evidence concerns "classical" poetry, forming part of an established canon. But when either the host or one of the guests was a poet himself, he might well contribute some poetry of his own. The Greek epigrammatist Lucillius, who wrote at Rome around the time of Nero, proposes the "novel law (νόμος)" that no guest will perform lyric poetry at his banquet (*AP* 11.10), and elsewhere complains of a host who serves raw meat and rawer wine, but floods his guests with epigrams (*AP* 11.137)[26]. In the same vein, Martial points out that even an exquisite dinner is spoilt when the host holds endless recitations of execrable poetry (3.45 and 50). When he himself invites people, he reassures them that he will *not* recite[27]. But this ironic self-deprecation gives us no reason to disbelieve that he was a popular entertainer at meals, his own, but especially those of his patrons. His kind of epigram lacked the sweetness of the songs of love and wine more usually associated with the symposium, but fitted in perfectly with another sympotic practice: jesting and mockery, to which Plutarch devoted another chapter of his *Convivial Questions* (2.1)[28]. If Martial's satiric epigrams were indeed performed at symposia,

---

[24] *Ibid.* 712f–713d; on Sappho and Anacreon being sung see 711d (Sappho also at 622c); cf. also Gel. 19.9, quoting *Anacreont.* 4 (3).

[25] Juv. 11.179–82, Pers. 1.30–40.

[26] For earlier, Hellenistic, evidence see Reitzenstein 1893: 87–96 (with 1907: 89), Cameron 1995: 71–103, Gutzwiller 1998: 4–5, 115–82. Even although the symposium is quite often employed as a fictional, not a real setting (see below), enough evidence for the practice of the sympotic performance of epigrams remains.

[27] Mart. 5.78.25, 11.52.16 (while allowing his guest to recite his epic or didactic poetry: 17–18). On recitation of his own poetry by the host cf. also *AP* 11.394 (anonymous) and Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 35; Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* 621b and Luc. *Ind.* 20 seem to refer to prose rather than poetry. According to SHA *Hadr.* 26.4, the emperor Hadrian *in conuiuio* heard *poetas* among other performers.

[28] The relation between mockery at the symposium and satiric epigram is discussed (but for Hellenistic and earlier epigram only) by Reitzenstein 1893: 26–27, n.2, 92–93, Cameron 1995: 97–99, Gutzwiller 1998: 171–74.

they would fulfil the same function (but on a higher level of sophistication) as the *scurrae cinaedi moriones* mentioned by Pliny[29].

There is the farther-reaching possibility that Martial not only recited, but also composed at the symposium. Impromptu composition of poetry is mentioned as a current practice by Martial's contemporary Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.7.19)[30]; his testimony can be supplemented with evidence which specifically refers to the symposium[31]. Even poets well below the level of virtuosity were capable of throwing off a few lines when drinking with their friends. The emperor Augustus, who did not feel confident to write directly in Greek, according to his biographer Suetonius (*Aug.* 89.1), nevertheless had enough proficiency to improvise two Greek iambic lines on something he noticed upon looking out from the dining-room (98.4)[32]. At a different social level, the half-educated freedman Trimalchio (a fictional creature to be sure, but designed by his creator Petronius as a parody of a real type of person), commemorated a small accident happening at his banquet with a few improvised lines, which the narrator explicitly calls an epigram (55.2–4)[33]. Trimalchio apparently wrote his epigram down before reciting it, but we also hear of poetry being dictated; in this case the versifying symposiasts are said to be Roman aristocrats[34].

[29] This will be discussed in ch. 3; see pp. 173–180.

[30] Quintilian may be thinking especially of Remmius Palaemon, his teacher according to *Schol. Juv.* 6.452 (but see Kaster 1995: 230), who *poemata faciebat ex tempore* (Suet. *Gram.* 23).

[31] On the improvisation of poetry at the symposium see Landolfi 1986; on improvisation in general Hardie 1983: 76–85. For Statius see ch. 5.

[32] He also composed a Greek epigram on another, non-sympotic, occasion: Macr. *Sat.* 2.4.31.

[33] The similar epigram at 34.10 should perhaps also be understood as an improvisation.

[34] The writing down of improvised verse at the symposium is also implied at Hedyl. 6 *HE* = Ath. 11.473a (see Cameron 1995: 86–88) and Catul. 50, but not at Pers.1.52–53 (see Kißel 1990: 179). At Pers. 1.51–52, as at Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.109–10, *dictare* means "to dictate", not "to compose" (see Brink 1982: 149–50) (but when in the 5th century Sidonius Apollinaris uses *dictare* in the context of convivial improvisation of *epigrammata* [*Ep.* 9.13.5], he is referring to texts which were written down before being recited).

Martial himself has one explicit, if somewhat enigmatic, reference to improvising at the banquets of his patrons:

> Lege nimis dura conuiuam scribere uersus
> cogis, Stella: licet scribere nempe malos?[35] (9.89)

> By too hard a law you force your guest to write verses, Stella. Surely the writing is allowed to be bad?

Lex is here a quasi-technical term (as νόμος can be in Greek), meaning the rules according to which the drinking is to take place[36]. Stella has enjoined on the guests to improvise poetry (with the use of writing, as in Petronius), but Martial protests; one could conclude from this that he did not like to improvise at meals[37]. But of course the protest itself *is* the demanded improvisation, which by its very virtuosity refutes the assertion that the result must necessarily be bad[38]. The partial obscurity of the final *pointe* (is it a question asked by Martial or—without the question mark—an answer supposed to be given by Stella?) is not a sign of careless workmanship, but indeed of original oral performance: when the poem was spoken, no ambiguity could arise[39]. In spite of its (seemingly) negative attitude, the poem should not be discarded as evidence for convivial improvisation in Martial.

There are various other epigrams where the poet is representing himself as speaking at a symposium, i.e. where the symposium is the setting of the poem. Before drawing conclusions about Martial's practice, we must ask where this setting is real, where fictional. A first group consists of satirical epigrams, in which Martial, following

---

[35] Shackleton Bailey prints *'licet scribere nempe malos.'*, taking this as an answer by Stella; see below.

[36] Martial also uses *lex* in this sense at 9.35.12; further passages are collected in *ThLL* 7.2.1247.47–61. For νόμος so used in Greek, cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.10, mentioned above. See further pp. 172–173.

[37] Thus Citroni 1988: 34, n. 56 = 1996: 56, n. 58. If 11.42 is about improvisation, Martial's protest there is not against the practice as such, but against the themes he is being set; cf. Kay 1985: 160–61.

[38] Henriksén 1998–99: 2.126 sees a pun on *malus* in the sense "abusive" (as at Hor. *S.* 2.1.82–83), apparently taking Martial to suggest that 9.89 is a *malum carmen* directed against Stella.

[39] For uncertainty about changes of speaker as an index of intended oral performance cf. Ehlers 1990.

the example of his Greek predecessor Lucillius, satirises the behaviour of either hosts or guests. The guests are usually mocked for gluttony or for pinching the food (or the napkins), the hosts for meanness, and particularly for keeping the best of the food and the wine for themselves. Although some of Martial's epigrams in this vein (like those of Lucilius before him) are notionally spoken *after* the events they describe, most are set at the symposium itself. But being satirical in character, they necessarily employ fictional, not real address, whether the "I" of the poem is a guest dissatisfied with his host, a host offended by a guest, or a guest indignant about a fellow-guest[40]. So we are not allowed to conclude that these poems were really spoken at a symposium. But neither are we allowed to conclude that they were not: the critical discussion of the behaviour of hosts and guests in general was a favourite topic of sympotic conversation, and Martial may have transformed such conversation into his own type of satiric epigram[41].

The more traditional kind of sympotic poem, in which the poet exhorts his companions to drink, is virtually absent from Martial's epigrams[42]. There are a few examples of address to cupbearers, but these all have a special point: in 9.93 Martial wishes to drink the health of the emperor, in 11.6 he underlines his intention to write for the Saturnalia, in 11.11 he rejects expensive table-ware, in 11.26 he asks for sex as well as wine, and in 11.36 he celebrates the recovery from illness of C. Julius Proculus. So the sympotic motif is in the service of adulation, poetics, moralism, eroticism, and social duty, respectively, which creates the suspicion that these poems employ the sympotic setting as a mere fiction. The position is somewhat different, however, for 8.50 (51), which opens with a long description of a precious bowl, a gift from Instanius Rufus, and then turns to a slave-boy Cestus with the request to fill up the bowl with wine. In this case the thought of sympotic improvisation is supported by an-

40 Poems spoken after the event: 1.43, 3.12, etc.; cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.205, 11.313–14. Guest to host: 1.18, 1.20, 3.13, 3.49, 3.60, 3.94, etc.; cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.137. Host to guest: 2.37, 8.23, 8.67, 12.27 (28); cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.11. Guest to fellow-guest: 1.11, 1.26 (both at a public feast given by the emperor), 3.23; cf. Lucill. *AP* 11.206–07 (and already Hedyl. 7–9 *HE* = Ath. 8.344f–345a).

41 See further pp. 173–180.

42 One could cite 1.106 and 6.27; perhaps also 2.59 and 5.64.

other poem, standing a little earlier in the published book, 8.46, where Martial praises the same Cestus for his great beauty and equally great chastity. This is to be taken as a compliment to Instanius Rufus, because it was a matter of social status and prestige to have beautiful cupbearers; if they were chaste as well as beautiful (so as to be impermeable to flirtations from the guests), their value was all the greater[43]. But in 8.46 Instanius' name is not mentioned, which suggests that the compliment was not designed for the published book, but for a situation where he was present, together with Cestus; this situation can only have been a symposium. As always, fiction cannot be excluded, but *if* 8.46 originated at a symposium, 8.50 (51) probably goes back to the same occasion. We should then have to assume that Martial rendered his thanks for the gift of the bowl by two virtuoso improvisations, both indirectly in praise of Instanius' liberal use of his wealth.

The particular interest of 8.50 (51) lies in its combination of the sympotic motif with *ecphrasis* (description), in this case of a work of art. The ecphrastic epigram was as conventional as the sympotic epigram[44], but 8.50 (51) creates a suspicion that Martial's exercises in this genre were sometimes composed to celebrate works displayed at symposia. This suspicion is strengthened by the two cases where we have a parallel composition by Statius.

In 9.43 and 44 Martial praises a small statuette of Hercules in the possession of Novius Vindex: the first epigram, in elegiac distichs, describes the statuette, mentions the name of the artist, and gives a history of the most notable former owners, the second, in hendecasyllables, is shorter and in a humorous vein repeats the information about the sculptor. The situation presupposed by 9.43 is that the poet addresses someone who has the statuette before his eyes ("Here" [1], "you see" [6]), but in itself, that situation might be fictional, and even if real, not sympotic. However, the statuette was also cele-

---

[43] See D'Arms 1991: 173, and on flirtatious guests add Mart. 9.25, 10.98 (and cf. 9.22.11–12, 11.56.12), Strato *AP* 12.175, Luc. *Ep. Sat.* 38. Other epigrams in praise of cupbearers are Antip. Thess. 3 *GP* = *AP* 11.24 and perhaps Mart. 9.103 (both without mentioning the master's name); in Mart. 7.15 and 50 (on a *tempietto* of Hercules in Stella's garden) the praise of cupbearers is generally referred to statues, but I think it more likely that real persons are meant.

[44] See P. Friedländer 1912: 55–60.

brated, in terms very similar to Martial's, by Statius (*Silv.* 4.6), who wrote in a much more leisurely genre than Martial, and found time to tell that he had seen the work at a dinner-party given by Vindex (1–34). It is likely that Martial had also been among the guests, and it is at least possible that he improvised his epigrams on the spot, perhaps in competition with Statius, who may have performed a first version of the poem he eventually published in the *Silvae*[45]. The close verbal similarities between the productions of the two poets would then find an easy explanation[46].

The other description in Martial which has a counterpart in Statius is 6.42, on the baths of Claudius Etruscus. Statius explicitly declares that he had written the 65 lines which make up his poem (*Silv.* 1.5) "within the time of a dinner" (1.*ep.*30)[47]. It would be an attractive thought that Martial performed at the same dinner. The circumstance that Statius (1.5.35) seems to correct Martial (6.42.14–15) on a point of detail could then be explained on the hypothesis that Martial had simply paid less attention to the instructions of the host[48].

Most of the epigrams on *objets d'art* differ from the epigrams for Novius Vindex and Claudius Etruscus in that they do not mention the name of the owner[49]. This might again point to improvisation: there would have been no need to specify the identity of the owner because he was present at the occasion and known to the audience. In those cases where the name of the owner *is* mentioned, the epigrams occur mostly in pairs (like those for Novius Vindex)[50]. This in itself

---

[45] See White 1975: 286–87. Coleman 1988: 176 follows Hardie 1983: 130 and Vessey 1986: 2795 in distrusting the reality of the occasion, but I wonder if *Silv.* 4.6 could have achieved successful communication if its narrative had not been substantially true.

[46] These similarities have been discussed by Steele 1930: 334–35 and Henriksén 1998: 108–11, 1998–99: 1.206–07.

[47] Statius' phrase *moram cenae* means "tempus vel spatium cenae" (Markland 1827: 160), not "l'attente du dîner" (Frère 1961: 1.13 with n. 3).

[48] For this interpretation see further p. 246.

[49] See 3.35, 3.40 (41), 4.32, 4.47, 4.59, 5.55, 6.15, 7.19, 10.89, 11.9; of these 3.35 and 3.40 (41) (and perhaps 5.55) are about drinking bowls, i.e. objects used at the symposium (which hosts liked to offer to the admiration of their guests: cf. e.g. Mart. 8.6, Luc. *Ep. Sat.* 33).

[50] See further 5.11–12 (rings with gems; cf. p. 158), 7.44–45 (a portrait), 9.74 and 76 (a portrait); 7.15 and 50 (a *tempietto*) are farther apart, like 6.16, 49 and 73,

is not incompatible with improvisation—indeed producing variations on a given theme, preferably in different metres, was characteristic of impromptu display[51]—, but caution is enjoined by two pairs which are so serious in tone that they are hard to imagine in a convivial context: 7.44 and 45 to Q. Ovidius, on a portrait of the man he had accompanied in exile, and 9.74 and 76, to the father of Camonius Rufus, on a portrait of his dead son. Moreover, in both pairs Martial refers to his *chartae*, i.e. his published books, and hopes that these will bring immortality to the owner of the portrait (7.44.7–10) or to the person represented (9.76.9–10)[52]. Therefore, if Martial performed these texts at all, he did so on the understanding that his effusions were eventually destined for publication.

I have dwelt at some length on the comparatively minor problem whether *ecphraseis* were composed at symposia, in order to show by the example of one group of poems that the evidence does not permit of confident generalisation one way or the other: some poems may have been recited, and even composed, at symposia, others not. This conclusion would not have been different if I had considered the epigrams written to celebrate departures, safe returns, birthdays, or weddings. All these occasions entailed convivial gatherings, and Martial may have performed at those, but there is no unequivocal evidence; in one of the few cases where he employs a sympotic setting (8.45), he addresses someone who is absent overseas, which raises the suspicion that the poem was never spoken at a symposium at all, but merely employs a conventional fiction[53].

---

which may all be about the same object (a Priapus); 7.69 (a portrait) stands on its own.

[51] Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 18. At Petr. 109.8–10 Eumolpus improvises (it seems) two short poems on the same theme, the first in elegiac distichs, the second in hendecasyllables; this combination of metres also occurs at Mart. 5.11–12, 7.44–45, 9.43–44 (and in 6.16, 49, 73).

[52] The implications of *chartis ... meis* at 9.76.10 are missed by Henriksén 1998–99: 2.91 and 97, who sees 9.76 as an inscription to be placed beneath the picture.

[53] Meals at weddings, birthdays, arrivals, and departures are mentioned together by Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 679c–d. Further evidence for wedding meals is collected by Blümner 1911: 357 and for *cenae aduenticiae* by Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 401–02; on birthday meals see W. Schmidt 1908: 20–21 and 28. One may add the sacrificial meals on recovery from illness or deliverance from danger, called σωτήρια (see

Moreover, the most frequent type of occasional poetry in Martial is funerary poetry, and this is unlikely to have been delivered at symposia (at least in so far as the deceased was a real person, not a fictional butt[54]). Nor are there any indications that Martial performed at the cremation ceremonies themselves. On the other side, many of his funerary poems to real addressees take the form of fictional epitaphs, and thus present themselves as written texts, as ἐπι-γράμματα in the etymological meaning of "in-scriptions"[55]. Even here, oral performance cannot be strictly excluded, but in any case these texts remind us that, if an epigram could be a succession of words articulated by a speaker, it could also be a string of signs on a page.

Presentation in Writing

Poetry in manuscript was important for Martial because a manuscript was something which could be handed over or sent, in other words which could function as a gift. At least one of the occasions which have just been discussed as being connected with convivial meals was also connected with gift-giving, namely a person's birthday[56]. In a poem on the birthday of the lawyer Restitutus, Martial details

---

F. Pfister, "Soteria", *RE* 2.3.1 [1927], 1221–31); Martial's epigram on the recovery of Julius Proculus (11.36) employs a sympotic setting.

[54] Poems like 9.29 (satirical epitaph of a procuress) or 10.63 (epitaph of a chaste lady, but with *mentula* in the last line) are conceivable at a symposium, as are all poems in which not only the inscriptional character, but also the act of mourning is fictional. Thus Callimachus' epitaph of himself (30 *HE* = *Ep.* 35 Pf. = *AP* 7.415), where he mentions his own ability to οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι, is widely held to have been a sympotic impromptu itself: see Reitzenstein 1893: 87–88, Gow-Page, *HE* 2.188, Hardie 1983: 83–85 (on καίρια).

[55] It cannot always be decided whether a poem presents itself as an epitaph or merely as an address using some of the topoi of epitaphs, but cf. 1.116, 5.34, 6.28, 6.52, 6.68, 6.76, 7.40, 7.96, 10.53, 10.61, 10.71, 11.13, 11.91,12.52.

[56] On birthday gifts see W. Schmidt 1908: 19–20 (Greek), 28–29 (Roman). Although gifts at weddings were common in Greece, there is no evidence from Rome; see Stuiber 1978: 696 (the two passages adduced by Treggiari 1991: 165, n. 50 both refer to the Greek world). On the other hand, at Rome the recovery from illness was celebrated not only with sacrificial meals (cf. n. 53), but also with gifts, likewise called *soteria*, as appears from Mart. 12.56.

which kind of gift is to be hoped for from which kind of person; he concludes:

> Si mittit sua quisque, quid poetam
> missurum tibi, Restitute, credis? (10.87.19–20)

> If each one sends his own special gifts, what do you think, Restitutus, that a poet will send you?

The answer is of course "poetry"[57], but unfortunately the epigram does not specify precisely which poetry. There are three possibilities.

A first possibility is suggested by an epigram of Leonides of Alexandria on the birthday of the empress Agrippina (8 *FGE* = *AP* 6.329). Just like Martial, Leonides enumerates the gifts of others, before revealing that the gift of the poet is poetry, in this case "two distichs", i.e. the epigram itself. But, as Leonides further explains, these distichs are constructed on a peculiar principle (called *isopsephia*): if the letters of the text are given numerical values, and if these values are then added up, the totals for both distichs will prove to be equal[58]. Martial's epigram has nothing comparable to offer, but perhaps it makes up for its lack of arithmetical virtuosity by its much greater length (twenty lines as against four); if so, it was no less suitable as a gift than Leonides' flashier, but shorter composition.

But there is also another possibility, which can be exemplified from another epigram of a Greek poet for a noble Roman addressee. Antipater of Thessalonica declares (31 *GP* = *AP* 9.93) that his birthday present for his patron Piso is a "little book" (βίβλον/ μικρὴν: 1–2), at which he had worked only a single night (ἐν ... μιῇ νυκτὶ πονησάμενος: 2). The short time needed for producing the book suggests that it was an informal collection of only a few epigrams, not a full-fledged volume meant for publication[59]. Applied to Mar-

[57] For poetry offered at birthdays see W. Schmidt as in n. 56; cf. also Argetsinger 1992.

[58] For a lucid exposition of *isopsephia* (which I simplify here) see Page, *FGE*, 503–06, 508–10, who shows that *all* epigrams by Leonides are to be presumed isopsephic (even if emendation is sometimes needed to make them so). They include three further birthday gifts: 1, 4, and 30 *FGE* = *AP* 6.321, 6.325, and 9.353; 2 *FGE* = *AP* 6.322 is a gift for the Saturnalia.

[59] This conclusion is not quite certain, because Antipater does not say that he *wrote* the book in a single night, and may have used older poems he had at hand; cf. pp. 115–116 on Martial's Book 12, put together *paucissimis diebus* (12.*ep*.20–21).

tial, this would mean that the epigram addressing Restitutus originally accompanied a small number of other epigrams, some or all of which subsequently would have been included in the published book, just as the introductory epigram itself.

If the poet could send an unpublished collection, he could also send a published book, and this is the third possibility. Martial's gift to Restitutus would then have consisted in Book 9 (the presentation epigram being included in Book 10), or even in Book 10 itself. The latter hypothesis seems not very plausible (the epigram comes only in eighty-seventh position, and the book would have to have been published around Restitutus' birthday in October), but I mention it because it points to the more general question whether an epigram written to accompany a book can refer to the published book in which it now stands, a question which will become important in what follows.

Consideration of Martial's epigram for Restitutus has led us to posit that offering poetry in manuscript could in principle take three forms: the poet could offer a single poem, an unpublished collection, or a published book. About the first form I will be very brief. There is little reason to doubt that at the occasions listed above (departure, marriage, death, etc.) Martial offered single epigrams (or sometimes pairs of epigrams) to his friends and patrons[60]. On the other hand it is usually fruitless to try to determine in individual cases whether the epigram in question was presented orally or as a manuscript. But when the epigram accompanies a gift (or is itself a gift), the use of writing seems certain, especially when the gift is declared to be *sent* to the addressee, as almost invariably happens[61].

It has already been remarked in Chapter 1 that the most frequent gifts in Martial are collections of his own poetry. Now the question

[60] Cf. above, p. 91 (and p. 39 with n. 5). There is one example of three epigrams being offered: 7.21–23, on a ceremony commemorating the birthday of the poet Lucan, to his widow, Argentaria Polla. There are six epigrams celebrating the dedication of the hair of the imperial freedman Earinus (9.11–13, 16–17, 36); I assume that at least the first five of these were offered to him on the occasion itself; cf. Henriksén 1998–99: 1.89–92.

[61] Cf. p. 78, n. 141 for a list of epigrams accompanying gifts other than poetry; in almost all of these epigrams the verb *mittere* is used. Epigrams accompanying gifts of poetry will be discussed below.

has to be asked whether these collections were occasional volumes or published books. In an influential article of 1974, Peter White systematically argued for the hypothesis that Martial did not limit himself to sending single epigrams on specific occasions, but often presented his patrons with small collections, which White proposes to call *libelli* and characterises as "private", "informal" and "unpublished"[62]. However, the word *libellus* in Martial often denotes a published book (as White is well aware[63]), and there is some slight awkwardness in selecting the word as a quasi-technical term for what is supposedly "unpublished". I will therefore use it only when no misunderstanding is possible.

In surveying the evidence, White does not distinguish between poetry for the emperor and poetry for non-imperial patrons. Yet it is necessary to do this, because one cannot assume *a priori* that Martial's practice was the same with respect to both categories. I discuss the evidence about the emperor in Chapter 8, where I argue that in the years before Martial started publishing on a regular basis, he certainly offered unpublished collections to the emperor, but that it is doubtful whether he continued to do so after his *corpus* was well under way; I also argue that these collections were all offered on a specific occasion and were made up exclusively of epigrams celebrating that occasion[64]. But repeated celebrations of the same occasion are not found for non-imperial patrons[65]. Indeed White assumes that collections for non-imperial patrons did not have such an occasion-centred character, but consisted of epigrams for entertainment (jocular, skoptic, erotic, in proportions adapted to the tastes of the

[62] White 1974, esp. 44–48, 56–57. The hypothesis itself was current in the older scholarship on Martial, mostly with reference to the period preceding the publication of Book 1 (cf. Citroni 1975: 7, with bibliography), but sometimes with reference, as in White, to Martial's entire career (e.g. Helm 1955: 79–83). The discussion was continued by Citroni 1988, Fowler 1995 and White 1996 (where he re-affirms his position); Citroni is the only one to distinguish between single poems and collections and between collections for the emperor and for non-imperial patrons.

[63] See White 1974: 45, n. 22.

[64] See pp. 367–374.

[65] The only exception are the six poems for the imperial freedman Earinus; see n. 60.

recipient), together with a honorific presentation poem[66]. His theory is that many of such presentation poems were subsequently included in the published books, and that they can still be recognised there from being out of place where they are now read. He believes that all presentation poems which do not stand at the beginning of a book cannot refer to that book itself, because if they did, the recipient would learn that the book was being offered to him only after he had started reading it. The best way to examine this hypothesis would be to study all presentation poems in detail. But because there are over forty of them (counting only those to non-imperial patrons), I limit myself to the four in Book 4, which are a fairly representative sample[67].

The first presentation poem to a non-imperial addressee (4.10) concerns Faustinus, one of Martial's most prominent patrons, and begins as follows:

> Dum nouus est nec adhuc rasa mihi fronte libellus,
>   pagina dum tangi non bene sicca timet,
> i puer et caro perfer leue munus amico
>   qui meruit nugas primus habere meas. (4.10.1–4)

> While my book is new and the edges of the roll have not yet been trimmed, while the page, not fully dry, is afraid to be touched, go, slave, and bring this slight present to my dear friend, who has deserved to be the first to have my trifles.

There is an unmistakable allusion to the best-known Latin poem introducing a "new book" (*nouus libellus*) containing "trifles" (*nugae*): Catullus 1. In that poem, however, the edges of the roll *have* been trimmed, because the book has "just been polished with dry pumice" (2). This finished appearance is connected with publication, because Catullus prays that his book will "last for more than a century" (10). Now one might think that the unfinished appearance of the roll in Martial is connected with absence of publication. But that

---

[66] Thus Martial's alleged *libelli* for non-imperial patrons would be very different from those of Statius, which were entirely laudatory and occasion-centred; cf. p. 280 with n. 86.

[67] Slightly divergent lists of all presentation poems in Martial have been compiled by White 1974: 56, n. 63 and Citroni 1988: 33, n. 54 = 1996: 55, n. 56. As far as Book 4 is concerned, White included five poems to non-imperial addressees, but Citroni rightly eliminated 4.29.

cannot be correct, because Martial's wish that Faustinus be "the first" to have the book implies that shortly afterwards others will read it too. So the reference is not to a "private" text, but to a book meant for publication, and the motif of the unpolished exterior must denote Martial's haste to send Faustinus a copy in advance, before the other presentation copies go out[68]. The question remains which of the published books is meant. It cannot be the previous book, because the epigram offering Book 3 to Faustinus stands at the beginning of Book 3 itself (3.2). So our epigram, even if it does not stand quite so near to the beginning, must likewise be a presentation of the book in which it is published.

The next poem, 4.14, is addressed to Silius Italicus, ex-consul and epic poet, who receives from Martial *lasciuis madidos iocis libellos* (12). In the old Loeb translation by Ker this is rendered as "poems steeped in wanton quips", in the new one by Shackleton Bailey as "little books, all steeped in wanton jests". The latter must be right, because whenever Martial uses *ioci* in a context of poetry, the word means something like "light-hearted epigrams"[69]. So the *libelli* are indeed "little books", and the question becomes which little books. It is highly unlikely that Martial sent two (or more) "private" collections, because no plausible reason can be invented why he would copy the poems he wished to offer into two (or more) rolls rather than into one[70]. So we must assume published books, and the question is whether these books included Book 4 itself.

At this point it becomes important that Martial made his gift at the Saturnalia, i.e. in Mid-December. Other epigrams accompanying collections of poetry as a Saturnalian gift occur in Books 5, 7, 10,

---

[68] Cf. below, p. 130 on 8.72. To my mind, Martial's wit lies in deviating from Catullus, and I see therefore no reason to assume that he, like Catullus, establishes a correspondence between external and internal "finish"; differently G.D. Williams 1992: 181.

[69] Cf. esp. 1.*ep*.8, 4.49.2 (in both cases parallel with *epigrammata*), 7.8.9, 10.18 (17).3 (in both cases parallel with *carmina*). In 4.10 and 7.80 *ioci* form the contents of a *libellus* (in the singular and certainly meaning "little book") and in 5.15 of a *liber* (in 10.64 the *ioci* are contained in *libelli*, as in 4.14). I prescind here from the question whether *libelli* can mean "poems" at all; cf. Citroni 1975: 7.

[70] It is to be noted that there is no metrical reason why Martial could not have written *madidum ... libellum*.

and 11[71]. Of all these books it is certain or at least probable that they were published at the Saturnalia, so that the presentation poems presumably refer to the book itself[72]. As for Book 4, its date of publication depends on the date of 4.11, an indignant address to Antonius Saturninus, the leader of a military revolt in Upper Germany. Most historians believe that the rebellion was declared on 1 January and became known in Rome about ten days later (Domitian departed on the 12th); in that case Martial's book cannot have been published before mid-January. But others have argued that the revolt must have broken out earlier (or at least have been in preparation earlier), and that the news must have reached Rome already in December 88[73]. If this is true, 4.11 will have been a last-minute addition to a book scheduled to appear at the Saturnalia[74]. Consequently, the Saturnalian presentation poem 4.14 would be in line with the related epigrams in the other books. The difference would only be that in this case Martial's gift included one or more further books—in addition to the book in which the presentation poem appeared.

A gift of more than one book is also the subject of 4.82. Martial asks Rufus to offer two *libelli* to Venuleius; but if Venuleius deems it too much to read both, Rufus can always read (or pretend to read) one of the volumes himself[75]. For the same reason as above, these *libelli* are unlikely to have been "private" collections, and must have

---

71 See 5.18, 5.30, 7.28, 10.18 (17), 11.15, probably also 7.72.

72 See Citroni 1989: 214–25.

73 See Citroni 1989: 217–20. Since then, the revolt has been studied by Walser 1989 and B.W. Jones 1992: 144–49. Both do not doubt that the rebellion was officially declared on 1 January 89, but both believe that rumours about what was on foot must have been circulating before that date; cf. also Strobel 1986a: 210, Scheid 1998: 157, n.1, Murison 1999: 245–46.

74 Poem 4.8, which is likely to be a presentation of the published Book 4 (see p. 365), assumes that Domitian is in Rome, and makes no reference to an impending departure. Moreover, Martial does not yet celebrate the crushing of the revolt, which was reported to Rome on 25 January (*CFA* 57.36). The fact that he did not wait for the victory may suggest that he had a publication deadline to meet, and, whereas it is hard to think of such a deadline in January, the Saturnalia would fit. Similarly, in Book 7, published on the Saturnalia of 92, Domitian's return from the Sarmatians, which occurred in January 93, is announced, but not yet celebrated.

75 The meaning of *tibi charta plicetur altera* (7–8) is "one of the rolls will be unrolled by you"; cf. Fowler 1995: 48 (who is wrong, however, to suggest that the word *plicetur* suits a codex better than a roll: see Birt 1882: 217–18).

been published books. But here the difficulty of assuming that Book 4 itself was included is somewhat greater. Would Rufus have had to read through two rolls (a task Martial himself characterises as perhaps too demanding) in order to discover near the end of the second roll that he is instructed to pass them on to someone else? Or, if Rufus is merely a fictional construct, would Venuleius have had to read to the end of Book 4 to find a teasing dedication to himself? Although I think that that is not inconceivable, other explanations can be thought of. It has been suggested that presentation poems were sent separately along with the book in which they occurred[76]; a less ingenious explanation would be that the requisite information was given orally or in an informal prose letter. In any case, the next (and last) presentation poem from Book 4 will show that placement near the end is compatible with reference to the book in which the epigram occurs.

In 4.86 Martial addresses his *libellus* and exhorts it to please Apollinaris, who is the virtual addressee of the epigram. If Apollinaris approves of the book, it will be immune against adverse criticism, but if he condemns it, its papyrus will be used to cook mackerel in or to serve the slaves of salt-vendors as waste paper[77]. This means that dissatisfied readers will discard their copy of the text or will re-use the papyrus on which it is written. As was the case with the epigram to Faustinus, the reference to the reception among a wider public proves that the text in question can only be the published book.

To sum up, none of the presentation poems in Book 4 originally accompanied a "private" collection, and all of them are best understood as belonging with the published book in which they stand. If other books had been considered, the same conclusion would have

---

[76] Cf. Sage 1919: 170.

[77] These lines have been correctly explained by Tränkle 1996: 133–37, except (I think) for *nec scombris tunicas dabis molestas* (8), which must refer to cooking, not wrapping. There were originally two motifs: one, going back to Catul. 95.8, of poetry books being used to cook fish in (see Thomson 1964), and another, going back to Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.269–70, of poetry books being used to wrap spices in. Both motifs were combined by Pers. 1.43 (see Kißel 1990: 169), and the combination is then taken over by Mart. 13.1.1 and 3.2.3–5, and by Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.11–13 (see Coleman 1988: 227–28); in the present passage it is slightly modified.

been reached, because the same types of poems occur and the same kinds of reasoning can be applied[78]. This conclusion cannot be refuted by pointing to the placement of many of the presentation poems in the interior or even at the end of a book; on the contrary, it will be seen that the distribution of the presentation poems within the books is an argument in favour of, not against, the view here defended.

If the presentation poems went back to earlier, private collections, one would expect that they would be more or less evenly distributed over the books in which they were later published. This, however, is not the case. We have already seen that the presentation poems to non-imperial addressees in Book 4 are placed in tenth and fourteenth position and in seventh and third position from last (and there is a presentation poem to an imperial addressee in eighth position). In the other books the picture is not very different: although presentation poems sometimes occur in the middle of books (especially in Book 7, which has to find place for many of them), they generally cluster near the beginning and near the end[79]. But of course the beginning and the end of a book are the traditional positions for comment *on that book itself*. So it will be important to see whether Martial conforms to this tradition or not.

To begin with the beginnings. Five out of the twelve books of the *corpus* open with an epistolary prose preface[80]. The preface to Book 1 does not employ any of the conventional epistolary formulas of greeting, but is nevertheless called a "letter" (*epistula*: 13, 17), obviously addressed to the reader at large, who is also the addressee of the first two poems in the book. So these compositions obviously

---

[78] See Citroni 1988: 33–39 = 1996: 54–64. The few poems of a different type (5.80, 6.1, 8.72, 10.93) will be discussed below.

[79] Of the 45 presentation pieces to non-imperial addressees mentioned by Citroni 1988: 33, n. 54 = 1996: 55, n. 56 (42 poems and 3 letters), 18 stand among the twenty first, 15 among the twenty last poems of their book, and only 13 among the on average about sixty poems in-between (a number which would be further reduced if one excluded doubtful cases such as 7.29, 7.52 and 7.68); of the 13 presentation pieces to the emperor (12 poems and 1 letter), 10 stand among the first ten, 2 are the very last poems of their book.

[80] There is no reason for the view that all books originally had such a preface (Immisch 1911: 489–97 is unsound). On epistolary prose prefaces in general see Janson 1964: 106–12 (with my remarks at pp. 281–283).

introduce a published collection. There is a complication in that the two poems and probably the preface as well are from a second edition, so that the original Book 1 would have opened with 1.3[81]; but that epigram, too, is concerned with the publication of the book itself.

If the preface to Book 1 is indeed later, Martial's oldest preface is that to Book 2, where in paradoxical play the use of a preface is rejected: Martial starts by quoting the arguments of his addressee Decianus, that epigrams can and should speak for themselves, and then, in agreement, abruptly cuts his preface short. He concludes: "It will be owing to you that any who take up this book will arrive at the first page without being tired." (2.*ep.*12–14). This reference to the published book itself is then continued by the first epigram, which illustrates Decianus' thesis by defending the book's modest length.

In the following books, Martial acts in accordance with his rejection of prose prefaces, until Book 8, which carries a fulsome letter to the emperor. There can be no doubt that this letter, together with the first epigram (to which it leads up) belongs with the published book, which it explains and of which it even specifies the number in the *corpus* (8.*ep.*5)[82].

In contrast, the letter at the beginning of Book 9 has a seemingly very private character. It precedes an epigram, on which it comments:

> Have, mi Torani, frater carissime. Epigramma quod extra ordinem paginarum est, ad Stertinium clarissimum uirum scripsimus, qui imaginem meam ponere in bibliotheca sua uoluit. De quo scribendum tibi putaui, ne ignorares Auitus iste quis uocaretur. Vale et para hospitium. (9.*ep.*)

> "Hello, my friend Toranius, my dearest brother. The epigram standing outside the regular pages is addressed to Stertinius the senator, who wanted to put a bust of me in his library. I thought I should write to

[81] See Citroni 1975: xix–xxi, 5, 13–14, 17–18.

[82] This is apparently overlooked by White 1974: 58, when he argues that the letter must originally have accompanied a private collection, because Martial' s claim that *pars libri et maior et melior ad maiestatem sacri nominis tui alligata [est]* (14–15) is not literally true of Book 8. But the phrase is easily understood as a flattering exaggeration (and Martial's other claim, that obscene jokes have been omitted, does apply to the book as published).

> you about this, so that you might know the identity of this man I call Avitus. Goodbye, and prepare for my visit."

It is not quite certain to what kind of lay-out "outside the regular pages" (*extra ordinem paginarum*) refers, but the epigram must have been set off from the body of the text in a similar way as the preface to Book 2, of which we saw that it preceded "the first page"[83]. Thus, the epigram was treated as a preface, which is understandable from its contents. It consists of two introductory distichs addressed to Avitus, followed by two distichs giving the text which Martial wishes to be inscribed on his bust in Avitus' library. This latter text carries an address to the "reader" (*lector*: 6), with whom not the reader of the inscription is meant, but the reader of Martial's works, who frequently takes up his books, in spite of, or because, the slight nature of their contents (5–8). The inscription, with its generalised reference to an anonymous readership, makes a suitable preface to a published book, but the epigram as a whole is an occasional text, and even displays an information gap with respect to the identity of Avitus[84]. Martial's solution to his self-created problem is rather witty: he provides the missing information in another occasional text, which has another information gap: Toranius clearly is a friend of equal status (cf. 5.78), but what kind of hospitality is he to provide? Martial plays with the conventions of introduction and presentation, and manages to honour both Avitus and Toranius, but without actually offering the book to either. In this way the primacy of the emperor, who is the subject of the first "regular" epigram, is maintained.

A somewhat special case is the preface to Book 12, written three years after Martial's return to Spain, and addressed to his generous patron Terentius Priscus, on the occasion of the latter's arrival from Rome. Martial apologises that he has been unproductive since his retirement, and that his gift of welcome to Priscus is nothing more than a hastily compiled collection, which he characterises in the following epigram as a "short little book" (*breuis libellus*: 12.1.3). It has been argued by White that this expression cannot refer to the published Book 12, which is one of the longest in the *corpus*, and

---

[83] Cf. Kenney 1982: 32.

[84] On information gaps and the problems of identifying Martial's various Aviti see pp. 39–41.

that therefore the letter and the epigram must go back to a smaller, private collection[85]. But it is possible that Book 12 as we have it contains posthumous additions, so that the book as originally published would have been somewhat shorter[86]. However that may have been, poem 1 specifies that the "short little book" given to Priscus took about a winter hour to read (12.1.4), an approximation which fits a published book, but not any smaller collection[87]. More importantly, at the end of the preface Martial anticipates that the book (here called not a "little book" [*libellus*], but a "book" [*liber*]) will be sent to Rome (12.*ep*.22–26). In poem 2 he then tells it whither in Rome it should go: either to the public library in the Templum Novum or to Martial's old patron Stella, now consul, who will give the book "to the people, the senators and the knights to read" (12.2 [3].15). Because such is the intended reception of the book, the prefatory letter is not meant only for its addressee, but also for the Roman reading public, to whom it explains that Martial's poetic career has long been interrupted, but has now been resumed, thanks to the encouragement of Terentius Priscus, with the publication of the present book[88].

All five epistolary prose prefaces in Martial have their own, unique character—such inventive variation is precisely what one would have expected from Martial—, but all of them comment on the published book in which they stand. Most of the books without

[85] White 1974: 45–46.

[86] Lehmann 1931: 48–52 noted that the manuscript family γ omits poems 4 (5), 5 (2 + 6.1–6), 11 and 15, which all seem to come from the anthology from Books 10 and 11 prepared for Nerva, as well as 28 (29), 29 (26), and 36, and that without these poems there is a regular alternation of elegiac distichs and other metres, at least from 8 onwards (47 [46] is also absent from γ, but because its omission disrupts the alternation, this is probably an oversight). Lehmann suggested that these seven poems were added after Martial's death, which is not impossible (even if Lehmann's further speculations about a critical edition [53–61] are groundless); cf. Merli 1993: 253–54.

[87] The length of an hour in mid-winter is about forty-five minutes (Marquardt 1886: 1.257), which on my estimate is not quite sufficient for reading aloud Book 12—but Martial wanted to *recommend* the book and therefore had an interest in understating the exertion required. Cf. 5.80.1–3, where he also mentions an hour as reading time (see below, p. 116), and 2.1.5, where an hour is specified as the time needed for *copying* Book 2.

[88] On this preface see further pp. 125–126.

prefaces begin with a presentation poem (or a set of presentation poems), which likewise introduces the published book itself. Thus Book 3 has an opening sequence structurally very similar to that of Book 12: in the first and third epigrams Martial explains that he is sending the book to Rome from Gallia Cisalpina (3.1 and 4)[89], while in the second and fourth he tells the book whither in Rome it should go: to Faustinus, because he will defend it against criticisms (3.2), or to Martial's devoted friend Julius Martialis (3.5). Book 5 opens with an epigram offering a book to the emperor, doubtlessly the same book of which the second epigram states: "the fifth book jokes with our Lord" (5.2.5). At the beginning of Book 6 the book-number is likewise mentioned: "This, the sixth book, is sent to you, Julius Martialis, dearest of my friends" (6.1.1–2). The first epigram of Book 11 is a presentation poem to Parthenius, certainly accompanying the published book itself, because a wider readership is anticipated; the second epigram is a declaration, addressed to the new emperor Nerva, about the licentious character of the book, again explicitly destined for a plurality of "readers" (11.2.7). Finally, Book 10 (which in the edition transmitted to us is later than Book 11) is not introduced by a presentation poem, but by an address to the reader at large, who is told how to deal with the extraordinary length of the book (the longest in Martial); the second epigram then explains that the present text is a second edition of the tenth book, specifying the number in the *corpus* (10.2.1).

The two books that are not introduced by a letter or poem commenting on that book itself, 4 and 7, both begin with a couple of epigrams honouring the emperor (4.1–3; 7.1–2, then 5–8); similarly Book 9 after the curious texts for Toranius and Avitus (1, then 3, 5 [6], etc.). In other books, homage to the emperor is combined with presentation, as in Books 5 and 8, and also in Book 6, where the presentation poem to Julius Martialis expresses the hope that the book may prove worthy of the emperor, to whom the following three epigrams are then devoted. The upshot is that all the books published between Martial's return from Gallia and the accession of Nerva, i.e. Books 4 through 9, open with homage to Domitian, who, moreover, is also addressed immediately after the introductory texts of Book 1

89 The epigram numbered third in our editions is spurious.

(4–5)[90]. And even with the less absolutist emperors Nerva and Trajan Martial is careful about his arrangement. Nerva is honoured immediately after Parthenius in Book 11 (2–5) and after Terentius Priscus in Book 12 (3–5); Trajan is honoured immediately after a series of five poetological poems in Book 10 (6–7).

Two conclusions can be drawn. First, the presentational texts (letters and epigrams) at the beginning of a book refer to that book itself. Secondly, the beginning of a book is normally taken up by presentation to the emperor, or if not, at least by homage to the emperor. This has obvious consequences for the placement of presentation poems to non-imperial addressees. If Martial wished to present a (published) book to another person beside the emperor or even to various other persons, he had to put at least one presentation poem elsewhere than at the beginning. The most obvious thing to do was to put them *near* the beginning, but not in unbroken succession: both social tact and poetic variety demanded that some neutral material should intervene. It is thus that we find presentation poems spread over the initial sections of books. But, as has already been remarked, we also find them in the concluding sections of books, which now have to be considered.

Among the books in Martial's *corpus*, five (2, 3, 7, 8, 10) end with a presentation poem, and we must again ask whether there is any reason to suppose that these poems originally accompanied a private collection. At the end of a book, readers will normally take any reference to a book as applying to that book itself, because such self-reflectivity is a common device for producing closure[91]. Martial employs the device three times in books which do *not* end with a presentation poem, and in all three cases he intensifies self-reflectivity by commenting on the fact that the book has now reached its end (1.118, 4.89, 11.108); moreover, he does the same

---

[90] See further pp. 376–377.

[91] What I here call "self-reflectivity" (i.e. the reference of a text to itself) is not expressly discussed among closural devices in the classic work of Smith 1968, but was recognised (at the level of poems, not books) by Schrijvers 1973: 148. In Antiquity, the final poem of a collection is sometimes a "seal" (σφραγίς), in which the author speaks of himself, often associating his achievement with his town of origin (see Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 335), as Martial does in the last two poems of the last book he published in Rome (10.103–104).

thing in a figural mode at the end of another book, where he proclaims the end of the Saturnalia, the festival during which the book was published (5.84)[92]. So it is to be presumed that in the books which *do* end with a presentation poem, that poem does indeed present the book of which it is the end[93].

If presentation poems occurring *at* the end of a book always concern that book itself, it is reasonable to suppose that this is also true of the many presentation poems occurring *near* the end. As an example I select an epigram which has been used by White as evidence for his theory of small, private collections offered before publication:

> Vibi Maxime, si uacas hauere,
> hoc tantum lege: namque et occupatus
> et non es nimium laboriosus.
> Transis hos quoque quattuor? Sapisti. (11.106)

> Vibius Maximus, if you have time to receive a greeting[94], read no more than this: for you are a busy man and not overly studious. You skip these four lines as well? Very sensible.

White argues that the epigram cannot have been written for its present position as third last poem in the book, because Vibius Maximus would have had to read through the entire volume before learning that he was allowed to limit his reading to these four lines[95]. But that is precisely the joke: after all, Vibius Maximus is also told that he has been wise not to read the epigram he has just read[96]. Moreover, "as well" (*quoque*) implies that he has indeed skipped everything else, in fact that he has "read" the book in the same way as the "Septicianus" of the following epigram (the one-but-last), who has merely unrolled the book to its end (11.107). By contrast, in the final epi-

---

[92] Similarly in the one-but-last poem of Book 4 (4.88) and already in the last poem of the *Apophoreta* (14.223); see Citroni 1989: 210–14.

[93] Additional arguments are that in the final poem of Book 2 (2.93) the book-number is mentioned, and that the final poem of Book 10 (10.104) is a σφραγίς (cf. n. 91).

[94] *Auere* does not mean "to say hello" (as translated by Shackleton Bailey 1993: 3.87), but "to be greeted" (*OLD* s.v. *aue* b).

[95] White 1974: 47. Also Kay 1985: 284, Citroni 1988: 36 = 1996: 58–59, and Merli 1993: 253, n. 58 think that the poem makes sense only at the beginning of a collection.

[96] Cf. Fowler 1989: 108 = 2000: 269–70.

gram (11.108) *the reader* is supposed to be asking for more (but unwilling to pay for it, which makes Martial refuse). So the epigram to Vibius Maximus is part of a sequence which combines modesty and pride, teasing of a patron and teasing of the reading public, in order to provide an effectively sophisticated conclusion to the published book.

We have seen that the evidence adduced in favour of the view that Martial used to present his patrons with unpublished collections, turns out to support the contrary hypothesis: that whenever Martial made a gift of a collection (rather than of a single epigram or a pair of epigrams in celebration of a specific occasion), this collection was a published book. What remains strange is that Martial did not simply dedicate each book to a single dedicatee, but usually offered one and the same book to a variety of persons, who all received their own presentation poem. We can only give a satisfactory account of this if we first clarify the two basic concepts involved.

Dedication and Publication

In English as in other modern languages, the word "dedication" is used for two different acts, which it is essential to distinguish: the dedication *of a copy* and the dedication *of a work*[97]. In both cases, the text expressing the act is likewise called "dedication". The dedication of a copy is the act or the text by means of which a copy of the work is given to a recipient. But the work itself, *qua* work, cannot be given in a literal way; at most it can be offered symbolically. Thus, the dedication of a work is the act or the text which establishes the link between the work and the notional recipient. Of course it is common practice for authors to dedicate a copy to the person to whom they dedicate the work, but that is not necessary, and not even possible if the dedicatee is deceased, or if the work is dedicated—as happens—to a collectivity (such as one's fatherland) or to an inani-

[97] This has been clearly explained by Genette 1987: 110–33, whose terms are "dédicace d'exemplaire" and "dédicace d'oeuvre". Genette also notes that in French the distinction is observed in the corresponding verbs: *dédicacer* for a copy, *dédier* for a work.

mate entity (such as a mountain)[98]. Such complications, however, are a modern phenomenon; in Antiquity, both types of dedication were inseparably connected. This had to do with the character of publication, which I will now try to delineate as briefly as possible.

When authors of Martial's time use the verb *publicare* for giving their work to the public[99], they refer to a set of practices rather different from those we take for granted when we talk of "publishing"[100]. In the absence of the printing-press, all multiplication of texts took the form of copying by hand, so that there was no difference in kind between private and commercial copies. Nor was there a difference in law: anybody who owned a copy of a text was allowed to make further copies and to give, loan or sell these, without there being a copyright to impose restrictions[101]. From the perspective of the author, this meant that he lost control over his text as soon as it was in circulation, and that the decision to "publish" basically was a decision to let the text go. The situation is reflected in the vocabulary, both of Latin and Greek: the most frequent terms for "publishing" are *edere* and *emittere* in Latin, and ἐκδιδόναι in Greek, all meaning "to give out of one's hands", "to release"[102].

The releasing could be done in various ways. In Martial's time it was customary to entrust the manuscript to a bookseller, who could

---

[98] I allude to the dedications of Syme 1939 and Veyne 1976.

[99] See e.g. Stat. *Silv.* 4.*ep.*18, Plin. *Ep.* 1.1.1, 1.5.2, 1.8.3, 4.27.5, 5.12.1; cf. the expressions *publicum accipere* (Stat. *Silv.* 2.*ep.*28) and *in publicum dare* (Plin. *Ep.* 8.3.2).

[100] The manuals by Birt 1882 and 1913 and (to a lesser degree) the survey by Kleberg 1965 underestimated the differences between ancient and modern publication. Although the influence of these unduly "modernist" accounts still lingers on (e.g. in Fedeli 1989 and Blanck 1992: 113–29), more recent discussions usually err on the side of "primitivism": see esp. Kenney 1982 and Starr 1987, with the judicious remarks by Citroni 1990: 57–77. On Salles 1992 (where publication is dealt with at 149–70) cf. n. 8.

[101] This was established by Dziatzko 1894.

[102] I give a few references for the Latin terms in Martial and his (rough) contemporaries. For *edere* (and the corresponding noun *editio*) see e.g. Mart. 1.25, 1.91, 2.6, 4.33, 6.85, Stat. *Silv.* 1.*ep.*6, 4.*ep.*17, 27, 29, Quint. *Inst. ep.*2, 1.*pr.*7, Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.5–6, 1.8.4, 13, 17, 2.10.6, 3.15.1, 5.10.2, 5.12.4, 7.17.5, 9.1.3–4, Tac. *Dial.* 3.3; for *emittere* e.g. Mart. 4.33, Quint. *Inst. ep.*1, 7.2.24, Plin. *Ep.* 2.10.6, 3.10.4, 9.1.1, Tac. *Dial.* 3.2; cf. *dimittere* in Stat. *Silv.* 1.*ep.*5. On ἐκδιδόναι (and the noun ἔκδοσις) see van Groningen 1963.

then make copies and sell them. In the first book that Martial published, the *Xenia*, he referred his reader to the bookseller Tryphon (13.3), as he still did a few years later (4.72); similarly, in the first book of the *corpus* of his books of mixed epigrams, he gave the names and even addresses of the booksellers where his work was to be had: for the book itself he mentioned Atrectus in the Argiletum (1.117), and for a collection of his juvenile verse Q. Pollius Valerianus (1.113); in the second edition, which was issued in the unusual format of a parchment codex, he specified that this novelty was available at the shop of Secundus, again in the Argiletum (1.2)[103]. But it was not necessarily a bookseller to whom a book was "relinquished". An author might also avail himself of an older method, well attested in Cicero's correspondence with Atticus, of giving a manuscript to a friend, on the understanding that this friend was allowed or even expected to make further copies, and thus to initialise circulation[104]. It is this latter method which is connected with dedication.

If the manuscript given to the friend contained a presentation poem (or letter), i.e. a dedication of the copy, this presentation poem (or letter) would normally be included in the further copies the friend had made, and would thus acquire the status of a dedication of the work[105]. This is the explanation why words like *dare* and *mittere* so often occur in Roman dedicatory texts (and their Greek equivalents in Greek texts)[106]: not because they are merely conventional expres-

[103] Tryphon was also instrumental in publishing Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (see the letter prefixed to that work); for the role of booksellers in publication cf. further Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.6. On the second edition of Book 1 see Citroni 1975: xix–xxi, 3–22. The parchment codex as a vehicle for literary texts (also mentioned in the *Apophoreta*: 14. 184–92) probably was an innovation of Martial's time; see Roberts and Skeat 1983 (esp. 24–29), Van Haelst 1989 (esp. 20–23).

[104] On Atticus' role in publishing Cicero's works see Sommer 1926. On the importance of the author's consent cf. *Att.* 327 SB (13.21a) and 329 SB (13.22).3.

[105] Of course there were exceptions. Thus the letter with which Cicero sent the *Academica* to Varro (*Fam.* 254 SB [9.8]) clearly was not meant to be reproduced with the text, and indeed has a separate transmission. But Varro's name was connected with the dialogue in another way, because he was the chief speaker along with Cicero himself: cf. *Att.* 320 SB (13.12).3, 321 SB (13.13–14), 323 SB (13.16), 326 SB (13.19).3–5.

[106] The material is collected by Graefenhain 1892: 5–10, 27–32.

sions for the dedication of a work, but because they go back to the actual dedication of a copy.

These terms also point to a correct description of the relation between dedication and publication. An influential theory holds that the dedication of a work entailed the obligation for the dedicatee to publish that work[107], but it is more accurate to say that the dedication of a copy was in itself already a form of publication, because by giving a copy to someone else, the author relinquished control over the further fate of his work: *dare* implied *e-dere*, *mittere* (if the book was sent as a gift) implied *e-mittere*. For that reason, White's thesis that Martial's presentation poems accompanied "unpublished" collections leads to a contradiction: these poems almost always use the vocabulary of *dare* and *mittere* (the latter often in conjunction with a noun meaning "gift")[108], and thus imply that the manuscript passes into the possession of the addressee, who is then at liberty to make and to circulate further copies, so that the text is effectively "published".

Of course, it did happen that an author gave a work to a friend, but did not wish it to be divulged. These exceptions, however, prove the rule. Thus, when the astrologist Firmicus Maternus urges the dedicatee of his *Mathesis* to keep it out of the hands of the uninitiated, his reason is that the work contains occult doctrine. Nevertheless he considers it as published, even if not fully made public, a situation which he characterises with the words "it will be enough for me to have published it just for you" (*nos tibi soli edidisse sufficiet*: 8.33.4). Different is the case of the medical writer Galen, who repeatedly complains that works he had given to friends and pupils by way of private instruction, but had never intended for publication, have been brought into circulation against his will. The word he uses for

---

[107] Birt 1913: 312–15 (who also makes an unfounded distinction between *dedicare* and *mittere*).

[108] *Dare* (or *donare*): 1.5, 1.111 (perhaps not a presentation poem), 5.18, 7.26, 7.42, 7.84, 7.97, 8.82, 9.26, 9.84, 10.87, 11.57; *munus*, *donum* or another word meaning "gift": 1.111, 3.2, 4.10, 5.18, 7.17. 7.42, 7.80, 7.84, 9.58, 9.99, 10.18 (17), 10.87; *mittere* (or *[per]ferre*) together with one or more of these words: 4.10, 7.17, 7.80, 9.26, 9.99, 10.87, 11.57, without: 3.100, 4.14, 5.1, 6.1 (on which see below), 10.20 (19), 10.93, 12.2 (3). In many other poems the act of giving or of sending (as a gift) is apparent from the context.

"being brought into circulation" is δια-δοθῆναι ("being distributed"), not ἐκ-δοθῆναι ("being released"), because he had not taken the decision himself[109]. Yet it is clear that the effect was the same: giving (διδόναι), as Galen came to acknowledge, means that one can no longer exclude circulation (*Libr. Ord.* 19.51 K. = 2.81 M.).

It was quite a different thing when an author handed over or sent a manuscript without giving it, i.e. without relinquishing his rights of determining what should and should not be done with it. This can be illustrated from a letter of Pliny (*Ep.* 3.10), where he explains to Vestricius Spurinna and his wife that he dares to send them a biography of their recently deceased son, even though it is not yet finished, because they have promised to keep it to themselves until a decision on publication is taken; in this case, *mittere* (2) is separate from *emittere* (4). Pliny surely intends to give his text to Vestricius and his wife later on, but at this stage he only shows them a draft, asking them to cooperate with him by suggesting additions, substitutions and deletions (5–6). Such requests for correction are very common in Pliny, and in most cases where he uses the word *mittere* of manuscripts, he refers to drafts submitted to critical scrutiny, not to finished texts sent as a gift[110]. Often, he would even expect the manuscript back, as is apparent from his most frequent terms for the activity he expects of the addressee of the letter: *emendare* ("to emend"), and more unequivocally *adnotare* ("to mark"). Because in such cases the book was not sent as a gift, the accompanying letter was not the dedication of a copy, and was not used, once the work was published, as the dedication of the work; thus, the only work of Pliny's to survive (apart from the *Letters* themselves), the *Panegyricus*, was apparently published without the letter which had accompanied a request for correction of the provisional draft (*Ep.* 3.13).

But in Martial we find a few instances where a request for correction of an unpublished manuscript (not just for judgement of the

---

[109] Διαδοθῆναι is used in this sense in *Libr. Ord.* 19.49–51 K. = 2.80–81 M. (discussed by van Groningen 1963: 2–3); for Galen's practice cf. also the passages quoted by Dziatzko 1900: 163–67, esp. *Libr. Propr.* 19.10–11 K. = 2.92–93 M.

[110] *Mittere* is used of unpublished manuscripts at *Ep.* 1.8, 3.10, 3.13, 5.12, 8.4, 8.7, 9.16, of a published book at 8.3; at 9.25 the reference is not clear, but in any case Pliny encourages the addressee, who is away on military duty, to pass the text on to others (cf. p. 157).

book as published)[111] occurs in a dedicatory text. An interesting case is the opening poem of Book 6, addressed to Julius Martialis:

> Sextus mittitur hic tibi libellus,
> in primis mihi care Martialis:
> quem si terseris aure diligenti,
> audebit minus anxius tremensque
> magnas Caesaris in manus uenire. (6.1)
>
> This, the sixth book, is sent to you, Martialis, dearest of my friends: if you polish it with diligent ear, with less fear and trembling it will dare to come into the great hands of Caesar.

The mention of the book-number shows that the book sent to Julius Martialis is the published book itself, but at the same time Julius Martialis is asked to correct it—and because he has to apply his ear, these corrections are not supposed to be limited to scribal mistakes. Yet the situation envisaged by Martial can still be reconciled with the model of dedication I have developed thus far: Martial gives the manuscript to Martialis, not wanting it back, but allowing and even requesting his friend to make any necessary corrections before publishing the manuscript; the dedication of the copy will become the dedication of the text[112]. It is in accordance with this reconstruction that Book 6 does not carry other dedications; for it did, there would have been a risk that copies came into circulation which had not benefited from Julius Martialis' corrections.

The situation is somewhat more complex in the case of the preface to Book 12, where Martial writes to Terentius Priscus that he offers him a hastily compiled collection (17–22), and continues:

> Tu uelim ista, quae tantum apud te non periclitantur, diligenter aestimare et excutere non graueris; et, quod tibi difficillimum est, de nugis nostris iudices candore seposito, ne Romam, si ita decreueris, non Hispaniensem librum mittamus, sed Hispanum. (22–26)
>
> Please do not object to estimate carefully and to scrutinise these texts, which only in your hands are out of danger; and please—I know this is extremely difficult for you—judge my trifles without favourable bias:

---

[111] The latter I would suppose to be the case in 4.82 (cf. above, p. 111), 7.28, and 9.26; related is the request to silence the critics by proclaiming one's positive opinion of the book: 3.2, 4.86, 7.26; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.*ep.*34–35 (discussed at p. 283).

[112] For this procedure in Statius see pp. 282–284.

> otherwise the book I will send to Rome (if you so decide) might be not only Spanish in origin, but also Spanish in quality.

Although the decision about publication is laid in Priscus' hands, the act of sending the book to Rome, and thus of making it public, is still Martial's (or Martial's and Priscus' together, if *mittamus* is taken as a real plural). So the reader of the published book is invited to make the following reconstruction: Martial sent the book to Priscus, who found in it, together with the request for advice, a few flattering poems addressed to himself (1, 3 [4], 14, 62); Martial then received the text back, perhaps with corrections which made it less provincial[113], and subsequently published it; although the letter was not the dedication of a copy, he included it as the dedication of the text. Conveniently enough, the letter could fulfil this function, because it already contained the information that was necessary for the reading public at Rome[114]. This would imply that Martial had anticipated Priscus' favourable verdict and had planned re-use of the letter all along. The time scheme even suggests that Martial cannot have waited for Priscus' reaction: he offered the book at the Saturnalia in mid-December, but assumed that it would be in Rome when Stella was still consul, i.e. before the end of the year[115]; that leaves little time to incorporate corrections.

A Saturnalian context is also relevant in the remaining case where a request for correction is found in a dedicatory text. This is the following epigram:

> Non totam mihi, si uacabis, horam
> dones, et licet imputes, Seuere,
> dum nostras legis exigisque nugas.
> "Durum est perdere ferias": rogamus
> iacturam patiaris hanc ferasque.
> Quod si legeris ista cum diserto

---

[113] *Hispanus* is used of someone of Spanish extraction, *Hispaniensis* of someone who is merely born in Spain; the contrast already occurs at Vell. 2.51.3.

[114] See pp. 115–116.

[115] That the book was offered to Priscus at the Saturnalia appears from a collocation of 12.*ep*.17–22 (it was offered at Priscus' arrival in Spain) and 12.62 (Priscus' arrival took place at the Saturnalia); cf. also 12.1.4 (the time is winter). At 12.2 (3).10 the book is to go to *atria ... consulis alta mei*; Stella's consulate is to be dated to the final months of 101 (Eck 1970: 148–49, n. 152, Zevi 1979: 197).

—sed numquid sumus improbi?—Secundo,
plus multo tibi debiturus hic est
quam debet domino suo libellus.
Nam securus erit, nec inquieta
lassi marmora Sisyphi uidebit,
quem censoria cum meo Seuero
docti lima momorderit Secundi. (5.80)

If you have time, please give me less than a full hour (but you may charge a full one), Severus, while you read and examine my trifles. "It is unpleasant to lose one's holiday": I ask you (5) to suffer and bear that loss. And if you read this together with eloquent Secundus—or am I too presumptuous?—, the book will owe you much more than it owes its master. (10) For it will be free of care, and not see the restless marble of weary Sisyphus, if it is rasped by the censorial file of learned Secundus, together with my dear Severus.

This poem stands four-but-last in the published book, and that, together with the reading-time of not quite an hour, make it certain that the manuscript offered to Severus (and Secundus) is a version of the published book[116]. The poem supposes that Severus (and Secundus) will contribute changes to be incorporated in the published text, but does not ask them to publish it. Differently from what was the case in Book 6, in Book 5 there are a number of dedicatees[117], and if some of these would tamper with the manuscript before bringing it into circulation, textual discrepancies would result. A possible reconstruction might be that Martial wrote this poem to introduce a pre-publication version of the book, got the manuscript back, and then moved the poem to its present position, because he wanted to begin the book with poems for the emperor. But this reconstruction becomes implausible once one realises that Severus is supposed to correct the manuscript during a holiday, and Book 5 was published during a holiday: that of the Saturnalia[118]. So, just as in the case of Book 12, Martial cannot have waited for the corrections. The dedication seems to have been written directly for the published book, and to that extent the request for correction is a fiction, as it seems to have been in the letter to Terentius Priscus. In any case, we must

[116] See n. 87.

[117] Apart from Severus and Secundus: Quintianus (5.18) and Varro (5.30).

[118] Both 5.18 and 5.30 (see the previous footnote) specify the Saturnalian context.

recognise that including a request for correction (and by that means implicitly complimenting the dedicatee with his literary judgement) was a second method of dedicating a work, related to, but not identical with the method of dedicating a copy[119].

A third method of dedicating a work was to address the work to someone, i.e. to address someone in the work, either at the beginning or throughout (as Lucretius addressed Memmius throughout the *De rerum natura*). In the latter case, one might be tempted to reject the term "dedication", because there is no specific part of the text which could be isolated as performing the act of offering the work[120]. But even if there is no *text* which can be called "the dedication", the *act* of "dedication" is performed, because addressing a work to someone *presupposes* offering it to him. For that reason Cicero uses the Greek προσφώνησις ("address") and προσφωνεῖν ("to address") as quasi-technical terms for "dedication" and "to dedicate"[121], and Quintilian characterises his *Institutio oratoria*, which he had expressly dedicated to Vitorius Marcellus (using the word *dicare*: 1.*pr.*6, 4.*pr.*1) as "the work which I wrote to my friend Marcellus" (*libros quos ad Marcellum meum ... scripseram*: *ep.*1). Such expressions with *ad* (in Greek πρός) or with the dative are very commonly used to indicate that a work was linked with the name of someone to whom it was offered, i.e. that it was dedicated to him[122].

If we accept the above, we are forced to say that each of Martial's epigrams which is addressed to a real person, is dedicated to that per-

---

[119] Cf. Citroni 1988: 37–38 = 1996: 60–63, who at 38, n. 64 = 62, n. 66 gives a list of requests for correction (or for advice on publication) in dedicatory texts, assuming that most of these are fictional. But in all these cases the reconstruction mentioned above for Mart. 6.1 (dedication of a copy, which the dedicatee may publish after correction) is possible or necessary, so that fiction is not proven. See further pp. 282–284.

[120] Thus Genette 1987: 110.

[121] Cic. *Att.* 320 SB (13.12).3, 327 SB (13.21a).1, 417.2 SB (15.13a.6), 420 SB (16.11).4; cf. the Latinised *adfari* used at *Brut.* 13. On this terminology see Graefenhain 1892: 28, 43, 45.

[122] See Graefenhain 1892: 28–31, 45. In the genre of the philosophical dialogue, a work could be dedicated to someone by making him the chief speaker; thus Cicero calls the *Academica* the *libri ad Varronem* (*Att.* 331 SB [13.23].2; cf. 323 SB [13.16].2), although Varro is not addressed—but he is the chief speaker along with Cicero himself; cf. n. 105.

son. This is indeed unexceptionable, as long as we do not confuse the dedication of a *poem* with the dedication of a *book*. The latter is always performed by Martial by means of texts (prefatory letters or epigrams) which in some way or other offer the book, never by means of mere address. However, it is obvious that the initial poems of Books Four, Seven, and Nine, which address the emperor on occasions unconnected with the book, nevertheless serve, by virtue of their initial position, to link the book with the emperor, and thus to dedicate it to him no less than the initial poem of Book 5 and introductory letter to Book 8, which do have the book for their theme. The technique was used before Martial by other poets who composed collections of poems to a variety of addressees, such as Horace: by putting a poem to Maecenas first, he established a privileged connection between that particular addressee and the book[123].

The situation we find in Horace is that there is a plurality of dedicatees of individual poems, but that the book as such is dedicated to only one of them; this can be paralleled from many other writers, including Statius, who clearly articulates the dedications of the books of his *Silvae* by means of prefatory letters[124], and Pliny, whose first letter does not have the same status as the others, but is a dedication of the book to Septicius Clarus (*Ep.* 1.1). Martial is similar to these authors by selecting only a few of the dedicatees of poems to be the dedicatees of books, but dissimilar by making more than one dedication of each single book (as I have tried to show above). This is an innovation on Martial's part[125], which must have been motivated by the large number of patrons to whom he wished to offer his poetry. This is a theme which will be pursued in the following chapter; here I need to point to a practical difficulty which his practice of multiple dedication entailed for Martial.

If a book was dedicated, the dedicatee would expect to receive it from the author before it had come into circulation through other channels, as is apparent from Martial's insistence in 4.10 that Fausti-

---

[123] See Hor. *Epod.* 1, *S.* 1.1, *Carm.* 1.1, *Ep.* 1.1; cf. also Tib. 1.1, Prop. 1.1, etc.

[124] But *Silv.* 5.*ep.* is the dedication of a poem (5.1), not of a book; see pp. 193–194.

[125] Cases such as the double dedication of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* (first to Vitorius Marcellus, then upon publication to Tryphon) are hardly parallel.

nus be "the first" (*primus*) to have his poems[126]. For Martial, who dedicated his books to more than one person, this meant that he had to produce a number of dedication copies and send these out to all the dedicatees before giving a copy to a bookseller. That was not very difficult to do, because Martial owned trained slaves, such as the Demetrius whose handwriting was known to the emperors (1.101). After the poet had finalised his draft manuscript, which might be studded with corrections, transpositions, and last-minute additions, he could dictate the definitive text to his slaves, who then could produce as many fair copies as were demanded[127]. Because Martial published one book at a time, his slaves would not even be very long at their task, although his estimate of one hour per copy (2.1.6) is surely too optimistic.

Yet perfect synchrony of the various dedications of the same book was not always possible, and we twice find Martial offering an advance copy to someone who is leaving Rome (so that there was no risk of premature circulation of the text in the capital). In 8.72 Arcanus, who is on his way to France[128], is given a copy which has not yet been fitted out with purple wrappers or trimmed with dry pumice, whereas in 10.93 Clemens is asked to bring to Sabina in the Venetan region a copy to which purple wrappers have "just" (*modo*: 4) been added, but containing poems which are "not yet divulged" (*nondum uulgata*: 3). It seems that Martial has found two different ways of

[126] Similarly 7.26.4 *hoc facetae carmen inbuant aures*, where the text is uncertain, but *inbuant* (which contains the notion of primacy) is not in doubt. Cf. Cic. *Att.* 327 SB (13.21a).1, where Cicero urges Atticus not to bring into circulation a copy of the fifth book of *De Finibus*, dedicated to Brutus, *ne ... habeat ... ἕωλα Brutus* (cf. also 329 SB [13.22].1).

[127] On the practice of ancient text production see Dorandi 1991 (as well as Dorandi 1993).

[128] He is taking up *annuos... fasces* (6) at Narbo, which suggests that he had to be there by January 1. This implies a publication date in December 93, presumably at the Saturnalia. The fact that Silius Decianus, who became suffect consul in September 94 (according to the *Fasti Ostienses*; see Vidman 1982: 45, 94), is mentioned as consul designate (8.66), does not refute this date, because we know nothing about the time of appointment of *suffecti* under the Flavians, and it may well have been December or earlier; see Talbert 1984: 202–07, Coleman 1998a: 342.

expressing the same meaning: that the dedicatee receives a copy of a book which is about to be published, but is not published yet[129].

There are other poems which send a book on its way to a destination outside Rome. In one of these Martial encourages his book to join Caesius Sabinus in Sassina (Sarsina), a small town in Umbria (now in Emilia-Romagna), and to anticipate a large reception through Caesius' mediation:

> O quantum tibi nominis paratur!
> O quae gloria! Quam frequens amator!
> Te conuiuia, te forum sonabit,
> aedes, compita, porticus, tabernae.
> Vni mitteris, omnibus legeris. (7.97.9–13)

> O, what a great name is being prepared for you! O, what glory! What a multitude of admirers! You will resound at banquets, in the forum, in temples, at crossroads, in porticoes, in bookshops. You are sent to one, but will be read by all (or to all).[130]

In the reverse direction, when Martial published Book 12 from Spain, he sent a dedication copy to Stella in Rome, confident that "he will give you [the book) to the people, the senators and the knights to read" (12.2 [3].15). Both passages illustrate the role that dedicatees could play in the publication of books by recommending them to others, but they also picture the kind of reception that Martial reckoned with among the public at large. This is the final topic to be considered in this chapter.

Modes of Reception of the Published Books

There are two main questions to be answered: the first concerns the identity of the recipients of the published books, the second the precise manner in which the reception of the published books occurred.

---

[129] Cf. 4.10, discussed at p. 109. Wrappers and trimmed edges were features of carefully produced rolls, and thus of dedication copies; cf. e.g. Catul. 22.7–8 (see Gamberale 1982: 150–56), [Tib.] 3.1.9–14, Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.5–14, Mart. 1.66.10–11, 1.117.16; further references in Birt 1882: 64–65.

[130] The *aedes* are more likely to be temple areas than houses, because the other venues are public places, and because elsewhere we hear of readers discussing poetry in temple areas (Mart. 11.1.9) and of poets reciting there (e.g. Petr. 90.1, Juv. 3.320–22). The *tabernae* are likely to be *tabernae librariae*; see p. 140 with n. 159.

To begin with the first question, in the texts just quoted Martial expects as readers of his books not only the senatorial and the equestrian orders, but also the people (12.2 [3].15), or, less precisely but more sweepingly, "all" (7.97.13). These expectations are in harmony with Martial's other utterances about his readership. At the time when he started to publish, he was still apprehensive about the reaction of the reading public, but already in the third book he boasted of being known "throughout the towns" (*per oppida*: 3.95.7), and from Book 5 onwards he is confident of being read not only "all over Rome" (*tota ... Roma*: 5.16.3), but moreover "all over the world" (*toto ... orbe*: 5.13.3)[131]. The latter claim was a commonplace among Latin poets[132], but Martial sometimes writes as if had some evidence. On one occasion he is flattered to hear, even if he remains somewhat sceptical, that his poems are being widely read in Vienna (Vienne) in Southern France:

> Fertur habere meos, si uera est fama, libellos
>   inter delicias pulchra Vienna suas.
> Me legit omnis ibi senior iuuenisque puerque
>   et coram tetrico casta puella uiro. (7.88.1–4)

> It is said that my books (if report tell true) are the delight of the fair town of Vienne. I am read there by everyone: old men and young men and boys, and virtuous young women in front of their strict husbands.

This text can be compared with a letter from Pliny the Younger, where he evinces surprise and pleasure that there are booksellers in Lugdunum (Lyons), Vienna's neighbour and rival, and that these regularly sell his *libelli*, presumably his epigrams (*Ep.* 9.11.2). But we have seen that the dissemination of books also took place by pri-

---

[131] In 1.1.2 Martial refers to himself as *toto notus in orbe*, but this text probably belongs to a later second edition of Book 1; in 1.3, which must have been the opening poem of the original edition, he is still uncertain about his reception; cf. Citroni 1970 and 1975: 12–13, 22–23. Other claims of being popular at Rome occur at 6.60 (61).1–2, 9.97.2, 10.2, 11.24.5–7, 12.11.8; other claims of being read all over the world at 5.60.5, 6.64.25 (*toto ... orbe*; variant reading *tota ... urbe*), 7.17.10, 8.61.5, 12.2 (3).1, 12.3 (4).3–4, and in the two passages quoted immediately below; cf. also 8.3.4 (*teritur noster ubique liber*) and 10.9.3–4 (*notus gentibus ille Martialis/ et notus populis*).

[132] See Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 344–45 (who do not distinguish between statements about present reception, such as Prop. 2.7.17–18 and Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.128, and prophecies of future reception, such as Hor. *C.* 2.20, but that hardly matters here).

vate copying[133], and this possibility is probably to be thought of in the second passage where Martial mentions reports that he is being read in the provinces:

> sed meus in Geticis ad Martia signa pruinis
> a rigido teritur centurione liber,
> dicitur et nostros cantare Britannia uersus (11.3.3–5)
>
> but my book is read to pieces by tough centurions serving in the frosty Balkans, and Britain is said to chant my verses

Whatever kind of distribution Martial may have envisaged for Britain, he can hardly have imagined that a centurion in the Balkans had access to a bookshop. He must have thought of books brought or sent from Rome, and indeed he himself had sent copies to people serving among the Getae, such as A. Pudens, who was, precisely, a centurion[134]. Pudens had the rank of *primipilus*, the first centurion of the legion, which implied that after his discharge from service he automatically became a Roman knight. So it would be to underestimate the social status of centurions to conclude from this passage that Martial reckoned with a lower-class public[135].

Similar caution is needed in dealing with Martial's claims of universal readership, whether in Rome or in a provincial town like Vienne. Before taking such boasts literally, we have to ascertain whether it is plausible that large numbers of people were in a position to read Martial. This question involves at least three issues: the prices of books, the possibilities of borrowing books from libraries, and the extent of literacy. A brief discussion will suffice.

---

[133] Pliny himself writes, when reporting the success of his first *libellus* of epigrams: *Legitur describitur cantatur etiam* (*Ep.* 7.4.9); similarly on the expected reception of a work by Suetonius: *describi legi uenire* (*Ep.* 5.10.3), where the comparison with Pliny shows that *describi* and *legi* do not refer to copying and proof-reading by a bookseller (as assumed by Birt 1913: 313), but to private copying (cf. McDonnell 1996: 482–86) and reading.

[134] See 6.58 (Pudens), 7.80 (Marcellinus; cf. 9.45), 7.84 (Caecilius Secundus). Caecilius Secundus is not otherwise known, but he seems to be an equestrian or senatorial officer, like Marcellinus (see p. 66, n. 88); on Pudens and his social position see p. 71. Cf. 9.84, on an equestrian governor of Raetia (see p. 66, with n. 90), reading Martial there.

[135] As is done by Best 1968–69. Best also argues from poems addressed to lower-class addressees, but these prove nothing, because the poems in question are satiric and the address is therefore fictional.

Martial twice informs his reader of the price of his book: the *Xenia* cost 4 HS (13.3.2), Book 1 costs 20 HS (1.117.17)[136]. The divergence between both numbers is surprising, even if perhaps not quite inexplicable, because Book 1 is about twice as long as the *Xenia*, and the price quoted for it is apparently that of a smart copy, inclusive of a purple parchment wrapper (1.117.16). The picture is further complicated when we consider the cost of making a copy privately. The information provided by Martial is difficult to interpret, but he may be taken to say that the price of a cheap empty papyrus roll and the wages for copying taken together were about 6 to 10 HS (1.66.4)[137]. All these numbers are difficult to reconcile with each other, but at least give an indication of the sort of amount we have to think of. If we recall that Martial treats loans of 100,000 HS as a normal feature of his everyday life, and if we think of the equestrian census of 400,000 HS (and the senatorial census of 1,000,000 HS), we must conclude that the cost of books was by no means prohibitive to people in the better walks of life; but if we realise that a client who paid attendance on his patron during an entire day received a *sportula* of no more than 6¼ HS, it becomes clear that for the mass of the population books were an expensive luxury[138].

But perhaps those who could not afford to buy books could borrow them from a public library? By Martial's time there were five or six public libraries in Rome that we know of, and perhaps a few others that we do not know of, but it seems that they mainly served the needs of students and scholars and that the books were not normally given out on loan[139]. Martial speaks of the public libraries in two poems. The first is 5.5, where he asks Sextus, who was probably the head of the Palatine library, which was rebuilt under Domitian, to

136 Cf. Arr. *Epict.* 1.4.16, where the price of a book by Chrysippus is also 20 HS. Martial mentions books (with texts of classical authors) as gifts for the Saturnalia in 14.183–196, but nothing can be inferred about prices; cf. Roberts and Skeat 1983: 24–29.

137 On this passage see Citroni 1975: 215–16. Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.7–9 gives the cost of an expensive roll (apparently without copying costs) as ten *asses*, i.e. 2 ½ HS.

138 Cf. p. 81, on loans, and p. 56, on the *sportula*.

139 For a survey on libraries in the Ancient world see Blanck 1992: 133–222, who at 215–18 discusses the extremely meagre evidence about how public libraries were used.

shelve his epigrams together with those of his famous predecessors in the genre: Pedo, Marsus and Catullus[140]. This suggests that the most important aspect of admittance to the public libraries was official recognition and canonisation as part of the literary heritage. Such an impression is strengthened by the other poem, 12.2 (3). Here Martial sends his book from Spain to Rome and instructs it to go to the recently restored library of the Templum Novum[141], or else to the house of Stella, who will read it himself and give it to others to read. This epigram clearly imitates the proem of the third book of Ovid's *Tristia*, which also accompanies a book sent to Rome from abroad (in this case from Ovid's place of exile on the Black Sea)[142]. Ovid pictures his book as seeking admittance to the three public libraries then existing at Rome (3.1.59–72), and characterises the most important of these, the one connected with the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, as a place where the works of authors both old and new "are available to be inspected by those who wish to read them" (*lecturis inspicienda patent*: 64). Thus, inclusion in a public library did imply that a book was "published", in the sense that it was made publicly accessible, for reading and perhaps even for copying[143]. Nevertheless, Martial associates the beginning of the reception of his book not with the Templum Novum but with Stella. So he does not seem to have believed that the existence of public libraries greatly increased the number of his readers.

---

[140] On the Domitianic restoration of the Palatine library see Blanck 1992: 193, on the identity of Sextus p. 343.

[141] It is usually assumed that the library of the Templum Novum (i.e. the Templum Divi Augusti, built by Tiberius in the Forum below the Palatine) had already been restored by Domitian (e.g. Blanck 1992: 163, Richardson 1992: 59, M. Torelli, "Bibliotheca Templi Divi Augusti", *LTUR* 1 [1993], 197), but although Domitian did restore libraries (Suet. *Dom.* 20), and although the Templum Novum seems to have been in use again by 88 (Mart. 4.53), nevertheless Martial's words, occurring at the beginning of the book, make more sense if the restoration of the library (if not of the whole temple complex) was completed more recently and by the reigning emperor.

[142] The imitation of *Tr.* 3.1 is combined with imitation of *Tr.* 1.1, esp. 59–62; the motif that the author's other books are the *fratres* of the present one (12.2 [3].6) occurs in both Ovidian texts: *Tr.* 1.1.107 and 3.1.65.

[143] Cf. Suet. *Jul.* 56.7, where *publicare* (cf. above, p. 121 with n. 99) seems to refer to inclusion in the public libraries.

The size of that number has to do, lastly, with literacy. Mass literacy was unknown in the ancient world, and many people attained to no more than a "poor" literacy, i.e. the ability to decipher short inscriptions written in majuscule letters, without being able to deal with longer texts written in papyrus rolls[144]. On the other hand, the category of people who were "literate" in the wider sense of being readers of books was not limited to the governing elite, but included many artisans and traders, the higher ranks of the army (such as centurions), practitioners of "intellectual" professions (schoolmasters, physicians, architects), as well as trained slaves and freedmen. So Martial's mention of the *populus* among the readers of his book alongside senators and knights is by no means unrealistic. The same can be said of his inclusion of women among his readers at Vienne: in the better circles women often received a literary education (even if less often than the men), and we know of many women with an interest in literature[145]. So Martial may have grounds for his claims that he was read by "everybody", as long as one realises that he can only mean everybody who reads literature at all[146].

Up till now, I have written as if Martial's readers read his books the way modern readers use to do: alone, with the manuscript in their hands. This is indeed the picture which is suggested by Martial's very frequent addresses to his reader, whether with the word *lector* or otherwise[147]. But there are a also a number of references to listen-

---

[144] On literacy in the Roman Empire see Harris 1989: 175–284, with important criticisms and modifications in Humphrey (ed.) 1991; on "alphabétisation pauvre" Corbier 1987: 57–60 and 1991. The difficulty of reading literary manuscripts should not, however, be exaggerated, especially because Latin books in Martial's time (unlike Latin books from the second century C.E. onwards and Greek books at all periods) had word division, punctuation (even if not standardised), as well as indentation of pentameters and other helpful "lay-out"; on these features see most conveniently Parsons in Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet 1979: 129–31.

[145] Other poems where Martial reckons with women reading his books are 3.68–69, 3.86, 5.2, and 11.15–16; poems *addressed* to women are discussed at p. 70. On the education and literacy of women see Cavallo 1985, Bremmer 1998: 171–78, Hemelrijk 1999: 17–96 (esp. 47–53 on women as readers).

[146] On the reading public in the Early Empire, Guillemin 1937: 39–102 is still valuable. See also Citroni 1990, esp. 113–16 on Martial.

[147] The passages where Martial addresses a *lector* are listed in Citroni 1975: 16; the passages where he addresses the general reader without using the word *lector* are added in Citroni 1991: 141, n. 13.

ing rather than reading, and these might suggest that Martial reckoned not only with "solitary reading", but also with "social reading", i.e. with reading aloud to a group. However, caution is necessary in interpreting these references, because it is possible that auditory vocabulary still refers to solitary reading.

First, it happened that solitary readers did not read for themselves, but listened to a slave or freedman reader, called *lector* or ἀναγνώστης[148]. Usually such readers are mentioned in the context of the symposium, i.e. of social reading, but they were also employed, at least sometimes, for the solitary study or even entertainment of their master[149]. Their importance should not be overrated: the same author who provides most of the evidence for such readers, Pliny the Younger, also shows that his reliance upon them was far from total: when he has an eye disease, he finds it annoying to have to abstain from reading, and to have to study with the ears only (*Ep.* 7.21.1).

Secondly, even the normal type of reading with the eyes could be described in auditory terms, as appears e.g. at the beginning of Apuleius' novel *The Golden Ass*, where the reader is told that his *ears* will be beguiled by a pleasing murmur, if he will but deign to *look at* the papyrus roll in his hand[150]. The reference to ears, in combination with the word "murmur" (*susurro*) probably implies that Apuleius was thinking of "subvocalisation", i.e. internal articulation when reading silently[151]. In Martial, there are no passages which combine auditory and visual language, but many of the epigrams which speak of the "ear" or "ears" of his readers are dedicatory poems in which he asks the dedicatee for a favourable judgement of his

---

[148] See Birt 1907: 171–72 and Starr 1990–91.

[149] In the following passages from Pliny this is either certain or likely: *Ep.* 3.1.4–5, 8, 3.5.10–15, 7.4.3, 8.1.2, 9.20.2; cf. also Suet. *Aug.* 78.2.

[150] Apul. *Met.* 1.1.1: *auresque tuas beniuolas lepido susurro permulceam, modo si papyrum Aegyptiacam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam non spreueris inspicere.* Other example of the combination of auditory and visual vocabulary are Hor. *Ep.* 1.13.17 (*oculos aurisque morari*) and Pers. 1.125–26 (*aspice ... audis ... lector ... aure*).

[151] Thus Dupont 1994: 237 and Valette-Cagnac 1997: 51. The importance of subvocalisation is stressed by Gavrilov 1997 in his important refutation of the common view (associated especially with Balogh 1927) that the ancients used to read out loud (a refutation reinforced by Burnyeat 1997).

work, in one case even for corrections[152]. This seems to imply that he is thinking of sessions of private reading, at which the acoustic qualities of his verses are to be carefully considered by the "inner ear". The Latin word *auris* in such contexts means little more than "good taste" or "discrimination" (just as in English one might say that someone has an "ear" for poetry)[153], and its use does not imply that the recipient is supposed to be present at a recital.

Nevertheless, there are a number of passages in Martial where auditory vocabulary does refer to social reading. In the letter prefacing the book Martial wrote after his return to Spain, he says that he misses "the ears of the city", and picks this up by stating that his work has been inspired by his *auditor*, "listener" (12.*ep*.7–10): here he must refer to recitals, including recitals of his published books. Elsewhere he states that his books please both the *lector* and the *auditor* (9.81.1)[154]. Another instance of *auditor* shows that a recital did not have to be a formal or a grand affair: Celer is the *auditor* of Pompeius Auctus (7.52.6), but the context that Martial envisages is a modest dinner for two (7.51.11–14). This Auctus also recited to others: he was such an enthusiastic reader (*lector*) of Martial's epigrams that he declaimed them to anybody who wished to hear them (7.51.5–7). This behaviour was perhaps excessive, but not in itself exceptional: elsewhere, Martial addresses his reader as someone who declaims his poetry all over Rome (*lector .../ qui legis et tota cantas mea carmina Roma*: 5.16.2–3). The verb here translated as "declaim", *cantare*, recurs a number of times in similar contexts, and refers to a careful oral performance; even if an audience is not neces-

---

[152] See 4.82.4, 6.1 (request for corrections), 7.26, 7.28.8, 9.26, 12.*ep*.20–26. In 13.2.9–10 it is not a specific dedicatee, but the general reader who is asked for a fair judgement; cf. 2.86.12, 4.86.1, 6.82.6, 7.12.2 and 11, 7.69.5, all concerned with aesthetic judgement. The other contexts with "ear" or "ears" are 6.64.8–9, 7.99.4, 11.3.2, as well as 7.52.5 and 12.*ep*.7–10 (both discussed below).

[153] Cf. *ThLL* 2.1515.41–1518.30 ("de auribus instrumento quodam iudicii ac uocum mensura"), *OLD s.u. auris* 4 ("a discriminating sense of hearing, 'ear'").

[154] The juxtaposition of *legere* and *audire* also occurs at. e.g. Cic. *Pis*. 71, Quint. *Inst*. 10.1.16, Plin. *Ep*. 2.3.9, 4.23.1, Fro. *M.Caes*. 4.3 (57.19–20 v.d.H.^{2}), Gel. 19.1.13. It remained frequent in Late Antiquity (Balogh 1928: 207, n.47) and in the Middle Ages (Scholz 1980, Zumthor 1987: 37–46, Green 1990).

sarily implied, it will have to be assumed in most cases[155]. This again suggests that Martial expected social reading just as well as solitary reading, the one reinforcing the other. The occasions at which social reading took place where basically two: the dinner party (as with Pompeius Auctus and Celer) and informal gatherings in public places.

The symposium is often mentioned by Martial as a context for the reception of his books, both in dedication poems and in poems discussing his reception among the reading public[156]. In the dedication poems he avers that he does not presume to trespass on the dedicatee's precious working hours, but suggests that his book may not be amiss at the symposium, when nothing more than unpretentious amusement is called for. Martial's apologetic strategy is patent, but it would not have worked if the symposium had not indeed been an occasion for the recital of light verse. This is confirmed by the poems about the reading public, where reception at symposia is treated as a self-evident component of Martial's success: "my book is a dinner-guest, a party-goer" (5.16.9). So there is a continuity between the reception of unpublished epigrams by patrons and the reception of the published book by the reading public[157]. In the section on oral presentation we saw that Martial recited epigrams at the symposia of his patrons; we now see that others recited his books at the symposia of people not necessarily known to either himself or his patrons.

When anticipating his success in Sassina, Martial assumes that not only banquets, but also the forum, temples, crossroads, porticoes, and bookshops will resound with his poems, once he has sent his book to Caesius Sabinus (7.97.11–12). Here, too, there is continuity between unpublished and published verse: "Severus" used to carry

---

[155] See further 6.60 (61).1, 7.88.5, 8.61.3, 11.3.5 (quoted above, p. 133) and cf. Plin. *Ep.* 7.4.9 (quoted above, n. 133) and Flor. *Verg.* 1.6: *uersus ... a lectoribus concinuntur.* On the meaning of *cantare* see Allen 1972 (Quinn 1982: 155–58 does not consider the post-Augustan evidence).

[156] Dedication poems: 4.8, 4.82, 7.51, 10.20 (19); poems about his reception among the reading public: 2.1 (and cf. 2.6), 5.16, 7.97, 11.17. Reception at the symposium is discussed in relation to function at pp. 166–180.

[157] Similarly, Pliny once recited an as yet unpublished book of his epigrams in the dining hall (*positis ante lectos cathedris*), in order that the poems *iam nunc adsuescerent ... in triclinio audiri* (*Ep.* 8.21.2).

the unpublished epigrams that Martial had read to him not only "to all the dinner parties", but also "to all the theatres" (2.6.7)[158]. It is notable that Martial twice imagines a kind of social reading when he sends a book on its way. In 11.1 he directs the book to the portico surrounding the temple of Quirinus, where among the many idlers there are a few who may be interested in unrolling the book—if only after they have tired of talking about the races. In 12.2 (3) Martial tells the book he is sending to Rome from Spain that it does not need a title:

> Quid titulum poscis? Versus duo tresue legantur,
> clamabunt omnes te, liber, esse meum. (12.2 [3].17–18)

> Why do you ask for a title? Let two or three verses be read, and all will shout that you, book, are mine.

Although Martial imagines a similar scene at the residence of a provincial governor (9.84), here he may have a bookshop in mind: bookshops were favourite hangouts for people with literary interests, and there is a scene in Galen, set in a bookshop, where a discussion about the authorship of a book is settled, just as in Martial, by the reading of a few lines[159]. If this reconstruction is correct, we would have one more illustration of the complementariness of social and solitary reading.

Even among people who are highly literate, social reading may be practised for the sake of contact and communication. In Early Modern Europe, social reading was not only practised in modest households, where only one member of the family could read, but also among the educated in *salons*, academies, and literary circles[160]. The picture must have been similar in Antiquity, where an intellectual like Pliny not only read for himself (whether with the help of a reader or not), but also attended recitations and held recitations himself. One could almost speak of "rituals of reading", which cemented the bonds among the literate elite and created contexts in which

---

[158] Not only did readers discuss poetry in public places, poets also recited there: see the testimonies collected by Wiseman 1982a: 36–38.

[159] Gal. *Libr. Propr.* 19.8–9 K. = 2.91 M.; cf. further Gel. 5.4, 13.31, 18.4 and already Catul. 55.4. The *tabernae* of Mart. 7.97.12 will also be bookshops (*tabernae librariae*).

[160] Cf. e.g. Chartier 1990 (the German version contains a valuable postscript).

opinions about authors and works could be exchanged. But social reading was not restricted to the *auditoria* of the rich: in a society where many had acquired the skill to read, it could occur almost anywhere, and almost anybody could participate in it, at least as a listener.

Publication, therefore, entailed a reception of Martial's epigrams which was fundamentally different from the reception which occurred when Martial recited in the circle of a patron or sent a patron an epigram in celebration of an occasion in that patron's life. "Publication" gave access to a domain that was indeed "public", in the sense that it was no longer restricted to the "private" sphere of the patron, but comprised unknown amounts of unknown others. These others were part of the collective consciousness upon which Martial's poetry worked. What this meant for Martial's patrons will have to be investigated in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

FUNCTIONS OF MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS*

In the only surviving document in which a patron speaks of his relationship with Martial, the letter by Pliny the Younger quoted at the beginning of chapter 1, the poet's contribution to the exchange is specified as the giving (*dare*) of "fame and praise and immortality" (*Ep.* 3.21.6). The idea that poetry can bestow immortal fame is not merely a *topes* of ancient (and later) thought, it is also an obvious empirical truth. Yet in any given case the person who is celebrated can never be certain that the poetry written in his honour will indeed achieve immortality. Pliny was of course aware of this, the more so because Martial's epigrams belonged to a slight genre. "But his writings will not be immortal", he imagines his addressee as objecting, and in his answer he stops short of contradicting this: "Perhaps not, but yet he wrote them as if they would" (*ibid.*). Where such uncertainty obtained, it was in the poets' interest to dispel their patrons' doubts, and indeed they are often found boasting that their own work, at least, will stand the test of time. Martial, too, regularly utters such confidence.

In an epigram reassuring the emperor about the harmless nature of his fifth book, he goes one step further and claims that his work is even positively useful:

> gaudet honorato sed multus nomine lector,
> cui uictura meo munere fama datur. (5.15.3–4).

> but many a reader is happy because his name is honoured, and he is given lasting fame through my contribution

As in Pliny, fame is given (*datur*) as a contribution to an exchange (*munere*). The implication that the honorand is put under an obligation is spelled out by Martial somewhat later in the same book:

> Laudatus nostro quidam, Faustine, libello
> dissimulat, quasi nil debeat: imposuit. (5.36)

> Someone who is praised in my book, Faustinus, pretends that he owes me nothing. He has cheated me.

In language typical for the ethics of exchange in Roman society[1], Martial clearly articulates that the writing of a poem entitles him to a return. He himself, of course, does pay his debts. At the beginning of Book 12, he declares not only that Terentius Priscus has been to him what Maecenas was to Horace and Virgil, but also that future ages will know about this through his poetry—in fact, precisely through the poem he is writing (12.3 [4 + 6.7–12]). There are also other addressees who receive promises of immortality, and sometimes Martial varies the motif by *refusing* the gift of fame to people who had asked for it[2]; this gives him an opportunity for joking, but also for implying that to be mentioned in his books was a favour much in demand.

But even though Martial seems to confirm Pliny's analysis of the function of his poetry as providing fame, Pliny's letter itself reveals that the acquisition of fame was not as unproblematic as it had been in former times. Pliny presents his exchange with Martial as almost anachronistic:

> It was an ancient tradition to reward with honours or money those who had written the praises of individuals or cities; but in our days, like much else that was splendid and excellent, this was among the first things to go out of fashion. For now that we have ceased to perform praiseworthy deeds, we think it inappropriate to be praised at all. (*Ep.* 3.21.3)

Indeed, in all his letters, Pliny mentions only one single case where praiseworthy deeds have been given fame by poetry. When he commemorates the recent death, in 97, of Verginius Rufus, who had won high renown for his role in the civil wars of 68–69, but had not participated in politics under the Flavians[3], Pliny writes about this long period of inactivity: "For thirty years he lived on after he gained his glory: he read poems written about himself, he read histories and was a witness of his own posthumous fame" (*Ep.* 2.1.2). The "poems" (*carmina*) presumably were historical epics about the civil wars, but

---

[1] See pp. 24–25; for *imponere* cf. Sen. *Ben.* 4.34.2; it is similarly used by Martial at 4.40.10.

[2] Other promises of immortality: 7.17, 7.44, 7.84, 9.76, 10.26, 10.78 (these are all in the later books, when Martial had grown more confident, but cf. already 5.15 and 5.25). Playful refusals: 4.31, 5.60.

[3] On Verginius Rufus see Syme 1991c: 512–20.

even if they should have been panegyrics on Verginius, they were unusual—Pliny implies that normally one would not be celebrated in poetry during one's lifetime—and anyhow their occasion had been a quite exceptional episode, in which the ordinary functioning of the principate had been temporarily interrupted[4].

It is precisely the ordinary functioning of the principate which Pliny holds responsible for the decline in praiseworthy deeds, as he intimates at the end of the letter immediately preceding the obituary of Martial. Talking about the themes of his letters, he complains that opportunities for writing on political matters have become rare, because "everything is under the control of one man, who for the common good has taken upon his single self the cares and labours of all" (*Ep.* 3.20.12). In the context Pliny is referring to the restricted autonomy of the senate as a corporate body, but his diagnosis also applies to senators as individuals. They still had political and military careers of greater or lesser brilliancy, but all major political decisions were taken by the emperor and all victories were won under his auspices. Moreover, not only achievement itself, but also the representation of achievement was subject to restrictions: triumphs and the erection of monuments or public buildings in the City of Rome had become privileges of the emperor and his family, so that the most prestigious forms of self-advertisement were no longer available to ordinary senators[5]. They had to be content with the more modest glories of a career, or, if they still thirsted for immortality, they had to transfer their ambitions to another domain. This latter alternative was recommended by Pliny in his obituary of Silius Italicus, a letter which has obvious connections with his obituary of Martial[6]:

> insignificant and transitory as it is, we should try to prolong our time, and if we cannot do so with deeds (the opportunities for those are in the power of another), we should do so with literary works, and, inas-

[4] The only example from the first two centuries C.E. of "straight" panegyric on a non-imperial addressee (if we exclude Martial and Statius) is the *Laus Pisonis*, written ca. 40 (see Champlin 1989); the absence of traditional military glory is a dominant theme (see Leppin 1992b).

[5] See on these developments Eck 1984.

[6] The connection between *Ep.* 3.21.3 and 3.7.14 is rightly stressed by Lefèvre 1989: 124.

> much as it is denied to us to live long, we should leave behind something by which we can testify that we have lived. (*Ep.* 3.7.14)

If one can no longer become immortal through one's deeds (*facta*), one should at least try to become immortal through one's literary works (*studia*)[7].

Pliny's own works were his speeches, which he carefully revised for publication, and to a lesser degree his poetry[8]. It is in accordance with this that Martial, in the epigram which was acknowledged by Pliny, praised the latter's qualities as an orator, singling out his speeches before the centumviral court and comparing these with Cicero's (10.20 [19].18–21, quoted *Ep.* 3.21.5). So it seems as if in the realm of oratory, at least, it was still possible to match the achievements from the time of the Republic. But here too, the change in the political system had not been without repercussions. The centumviral court mainly dealt with inheritance cases, which certainly could be quite spectacular and sometimes drew large crowds, as on the occasion when Pliny delivered what he considered his masterpiece[9], but which of course lacked the political dimension of the great trials to which Cicero owed his fame. Pliny's friend Tacitus brings this out in his *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, when he has Maternus remark that among the Republican speeches which are still being read, including those of Cicero, none at all was delivered before the centumviral court (*Dial.* 38.2). But in Pliny himself such observations are not be found, and it is difficult to ascertain in how far he shared Tacitus' historical insights. In any case he did not refrain from emulating Cicero as an orator, and also presented his verse composition as being inspired by Cicero's example, so that he could summarily say that it was Cicero "whom I wish to emulate in my works" (*Ep.* 4.8.4)[10].

[7] On this motif in Pliny see Guillemin 1929: 13–22 and Bütler 1970: 20–27.

[8] See Bütler 1970: 28–40.

[9] See Plin. *Ep.* 6.33. Other appearances before the centumviral court: 1.18, 2.14, 4.16, 4.24, 5.9, 6.12 (2: *in harena mea, hoc est apud centumuiros*), 9.23. On the court itself see Kaser 1966: 37–40.

[10] Pliny affirms that he emulates Cicero as an orator in *Ep.* 1.5.12, and recounts that he has taken up light verse after the example of Cicero in 7.4.3–6.

Pliny's emulation of Cicero also extended to letter-writing, but for this genre he did acknowledge the effects of historical change[11]. We have already seen that he was aware that he had only limited scope for writing on politics, and elsewhere he explicitly states that his themes are both less varied and less important than those which Cicero had at his command (*Ep.* 9.2.2–3). Yet it would be wrong to conclude from this that Pliny did not aim at immortality for his letters just as much as he did for his speeches and poetry[12]. The honorific character of the letters is so much in evidence that they make sense only on the assumption that their intended audience includes posterity. This honorific character in the first place concerns Pliny himself, whose self-presentation is obviously a central purpose of the *Letters*. But it also concerns the addressees, whether or not they have a connection with the theme of the letter addressed to them: if not, the address is best considered as no more, but also no less, than a complimentary dedication[13]. Finally it concerns the third parties whose character, behaviour or achievements are so often commented upon, almost always in a laudatory vein, only in exceptional cases (such as that of Regulus) with critical intent. One could say that each letter is a move in a negotiation about fame, Pliny's own and that of the people associated with him.

It is interesting to see on what counts fame is attributed. Of course exemplary careers in the service of the state and the emperor reserve due praise, but literary production, and especially the writing of poetry, is also mentioned, sometimes as a subordinate point, as with the elder statesmen Vestricius Spurinna and Silius Italicus, sometimes as the main or only one, as with young Calpurnius Piso, scion of one

---

[11] On Pliny's emulation of Cicero in epistolography (as well as in oratory) see Weische 1989.

[12] Gamberini 1983: 163–70 argues from *Ep.* 3.20 and 9.2 (both referred to above) that Pliny realised that his letters would not be immortal. In his desire to prove that Pliny expected fame only for his speeches, Gamberini (at 97–103) also underrates Pliny's expectation of *gloria* for his verses, attested by such passages as 7.4.9–10 and 9.25.2. That Pliny lists letters and verses among the exercises and relaxations of the orator (7.9.8–14) does not imply that they could not attain independent value (which he even expressly states for verses: *Lusus uocantur; sed hi lusus non minorem interdum gloriam quam seria consequuntur* : 10).

[13] Cf. Guillemin 1929: 58. This kind of dedication of individual letters is to be distinguished from the dedication of *books*: see p. 129.

the noblest of Republican families, whose poetry, Pliny avers, is on a par with the accomplishments of his ancestors[14]. So there is a kind of short-circuiting of fame and literature: Pliny hopes to acquire fame with his literary production, which partly consists in the attribution of fame to the literary production of others.

This is true not only of Pliny's letters, but also of his epigrams. Thus, in one epigram he announced the imminent publication of a work by his protégé Suetonius, apparently with rather a flourish (*Ep.* 5.10). In the reverse direction, Sentius Augurinus, a well-connected senatorial youth, wrote an epigram in which he declared himself to be inspired by Pliny's efforts in the genre (*Ep.* 4.27)[15]. Such compliments exchanged between high-class *litterati* were not much different from Martial's epigram in honour of Pliny's oratory, and perhaps we touch here the cause for Pliny's embarrassment. Martial stood outside the charmed circle of senators and favoured equestrians (such as Suetonius) complimenting each other on their literary works, and could only be "placed" as a traditional client poet, offering fame, to be rewarded with money. But not only the money, also Pliny's letter itself is part of the exchange, and that proves that the traditional concept does not quite fit the situation: Pliny owed it to himself to be at least as confident about the immortality of his *Letters* as about that of Martial's *Epigrams*, which entailed that he was at least as much the giver as the receiver of fame.

These considerations are not meant to minimise the importance of fame as part of Martial's contribution to the exchange with his pa-

---

[14] Vestricius Spurinna: *Ep.* 3.1.7; Silius Italicus: 3.7.5; Calpurnius Piso: 5.17. Other persons of whom poetic production is praised include Octavius Rufus (1.7, 2.10); Pompeius Saturninus (1.16.5); Titinius Capito, imperial secretary *ab epistulis*, later *praefectus uigilum* (1.17.3; cf. 8.12); Arrius Antoninus, *princeps ciuitatis* (4.3, 4.18, 5.15); Sentius Augurinus (4.27, 9.8); Passennus Paulus (6.15, 9.22); Vergilius Romanus (6.21); Caninius Rufus (8.4; cf. 1.3.3–5, 3.7.14–15, 9.33). On these poets see Fein 1994: 133–39 and 151–55 (wrongly identifying Pliny's Calpurnius Piso with the consul of 111 and taking him as the addressee of the *Laus Pisonis* [after Bell 1985]; cf. p. 83, n. 161).

[15] On the epigrams of Pliny and Sentius Augurinus see p. 96. Augurinus may well be the same as the Q. Gellius Sentius Augurinus who was proconsul of Achaia (or Macedonia) under Hadrian: *PIR*^{2} G 135, Fein 1994: 133–35. Pliny also mentions being praised in the "old comedy" of Vergilius Romanus (presumably in a parabasis), but does not specify what the praise was about (*Ep.* 6.21.5–6).

trons. Fame is built up by a great number of individual acts of praise[16], and a laudatory epigram by Martial is such an act of praise, and a particularly important one in so far as it will be repeated on each reading of the epigram. But in the time of Martial, many members of the elite expected to acquire fame by their own literary production, mostly in genres with a stronger claim on immortality than the epigram. Because of this, Martial's position was fraught with complications, and a discussion of the functions of his poetry must take account of these. Rather than adopting "fame" as a *passe partout* explanation in the way that Pliny and Martial themselves were inclined to do, we should proceed empirically and investigate what kind of texts Martial actually wrote for his patrons.

Patterns of Exchange

The first patron whom Martial mentions in his proud listing of "the leaders of the city and the Forum" who deign to read his works (6.64.8–15) is Silius Italicus, the author of the historical epic the *Punica*. Silius is an interesting person to begin with, because Martial's epigrams in his honour can be compared with an obituary letter by Pliny, from the same book as the similar composition about Martial himself (*Ep.* 3.7)[17]. As in the letter about Martial, Pliny does not offer an uncritical panegyric, but makes a calculated move in the negotiation of fame. Strictures are passed, but they are attributed to others, in this case not the addressee, but anonymous public opinion (as often in the historical works of Tacitus). One reservation concerns Silius' political career: "He had damaged his reputation under Nero (it was believed that he had been a willing prosecutor)" (3), which means that Silius was supposed to have acted as an informer. This becomes even more meaningful in connection with the circumstance, stressed by Pliny, that Silius had been awarded the consulate by Nero in 68. But Pliny also adds that Silius had brought home glory from his proconsulship of Asia, and "had washed off the stain of his former zeal through a praiseworthy life in retirement" (3). This

[16] Cf. Cic. *Inv.* 2.166: *gloria est frequens de aliquo fama cum laude.*

[17] The comparison has been made before: Vessey 1974b. On Silius Italicus and his relationship with Martial see also p. 63.

"life in retirement" (*otium*) was troubled only by the death of his younger son—whereas the elder attained to the consulate—, and was devoted to the composition of poetry and the acquisition of villas, books and statues, and to the cult of Virgil, whose grave in Naples he religiously venerated. Yet the praise people bestowed on Silius' retirement was not unqualified, as appears from a further stricture that Pliny reports: "He was a *connaisseur* to the point of being criticised for excessive buying" (7). Pliny's evaluation of Silius' poetry, however, is not borrowed from others, but his own, a classic formulation: "He wrote poetry with more care than talent" (*maiore cura quam ingenio*: 5). This sounds cool, even though Pliny characterised himself in a similar manner, disclaiming "talent" (*ingenium*), adducing "work" (*studium*) and "effort" (*labor*) instead (*Ep.* 9.14); but he called Martial "talented" (*ingeniosus*: *Ep.* 3.21.1) and was lavish with praise for the "talent" (*ingenium*) of his friends[18]. Silius apparently was no friend, and Pliny may have taken exception not only to his activities under Nero, but also to his adulation of Domitian in the *Punica*[19].

In Martial the tone is altogether more enthusiastic, of course. The first epigram addressed to Silius, a dedication (4.14), lauds him as an epic poet and compares him to Virgil[20]. The second epigram (7.63) adds another aspect: the reader of the "undying volumes" (1) of the *Punica* should know that Silius, before becoming a second Virgil, had been a second Cicero, by virtue of his speeches in the centumviral court[21]. This title to fame is not mentioned by Pliny, perhaps because of a juster assessment of Silius' oratory, perhaps out of professional jealousy: we recall that he quotes Martial as making the same

[18] Pliny explicitly praises the *ingenium* of almost all the people listed in n. 14: see *Ep.* 1.16.1, 4.27.5, 5.17.2, 6.21.1, 8.4.3, 9.22.3, 9.33.1.

[19] See esp. Sil. 3.594–629; 14.686–88 also refers to Domitian, not to Nerva: see Wistrand 1956: 31–44. Wistrand moreover shows that those passages in the *Punica* which have been taken as critical of Domitian are not in fact so. Silius' withdrawal to Campania, probably under Nerva, and his failure to return to Rome for Trajan's accession (Plin. *Ep.* 3.7.6–7) could also be explained from an association with the old regime; cf. McDermott and Orentzel 1977: 32–33.

[20] Martial's praise of Silius' epic is not inconsistent with his critical attitude toward contemporary epic elsewhere, because the criticisms always refer to mythological epic, not to historical epic of the type of the *Punica*; see Szelest 1959: 78–80.

[21] The reference and the language (7) echo the *Laus Pisonis* (41-42).

compliment to himself. Martial's comparison of Silius to Cicero also comprises the consulate, which Pliny does mention, somewhat insidiously, as I have suggested. Martial finds a wording which manages almost to turn the complicity with Nero into its opposite: Silius had been consul in the year "that was hallowed by the liberation of the world" (10), which sounds as if he had made some unspecified contribution to Nero's fall. The next epigram (8.66) connects the motifs of poetry and politics in exhorting the Muses to thank the emperor for the consulate awarded to Silius' eldest son, Decianus, an honour which is also anticipated for the younger son, Severus. Unfortunately, in the following year Martial has to console Silius on Severus' death (9.86). Finally, Martial writes two epigrams on Silius' acquisition of Virgil's tomb, not without making the obvious comparison (11.48 and 50 [49]), and one epigram on Virgil's birthday (12.67), which, as Pliny informs us, Silius "celebrated more devoutly than his own" (*Ep.* 3.7.8).

Surveying these epigrams, we see that almost all the information which Pliny was later to consider relevant to Silius' obituary is already to be found in Martial: the consulate under Nero, the contrasting fates of the two sons, the cult of Virgil, and the composition of the *Punica*. Martial omits the alleged activity as an informer under Nero, substituting success in the centumviral court, and employs a tone of unequivocal admiration. The provision of fame could hardly have been carried out more systematically[22]. Especially significant is the epigram on Silius' political career (7.63), because it was not written on an occasion, like the others: apparently its purpose was just to set the record straight. Pliny's view, that the main function of Martial's epigrams was to give "fame and praise and immortality", seems confirmed, even if we here meet the same complication as in Pliny's letter: that the fame partly concerns literary works which aspire to immortality on their own account.

If we proceed to consider the poems written for the second person from Martial's list of eminent supporters, the orator M. Aquillius Regulus, we will find further confirmation, but also the need for dif-

[22] The only poem which does not provide fame is 12.67, because Silius' name is not there mentioned (cf. p. 40). However, it is possible that this poem was not originally written for publication, and was among the older material that Martial used in making up Book 12.

ferentiation. Tacitus writes that it seemed that Regulus, when still a young man under Nero, "had willingly undertaken prosecutions" (*Hist.* 4.42.1); the expression is almost the same as the one Pliny uses of Silius Italicus' behaviour, also under Nero[23]. But Regulus' successes were more spectacular, and the hate he incurred was accordingly stronger; nor did he lie low under the Flavians, even though he undertook no more political prosecutions. But he was instrumental in securing the condemnation of Arulenus Rusticus, a leading member of a group of disaffected senators, and afterwards recited a pamphlet reviling the memory not only of Rusticus, but also of Herennius Senecio, another victim from the same circle. The information comes from Pliny (*Ep.* 1.5.2–3), friend of Rusticus and Senecio and inveterate enemy of Regulus, to whom he devotes no less than five letters full of bitter invective[24]. Most of the points Pliny makes about Regulus are also to be found in Martial, just as was the case with his points about Silius Italicus, so that a comparison can again be profitably made[25]. But this time the contrast between the two authors is far more pronounced, and should remind us that they were not only engaged in transmitting a certain image to posterity, but also in influencing the opinions of their contemporaries. Alongside commemoration we have apology and propaganda. In the case of Regulus, there cannot have been any *overt* controversies when Martial wrote his epigrams, because Domitian was then still in power, which made it unsafe to criticise Regulus directly; indeed, Pliny's savage attacks were launched only after Domitian's death[26]. But negative opinions must have been current, and Martial and his audience must

---

23 I read *sponte accusationem suscepisse ... uidebatur* with Wellesley. The transmission has *sponte exsc accusatio subisse*, where *exsc* is a remnant of *excusatio(nem)* being first mistakenly written for *accusatio(nem)*. Pliny's phrase of Silius Italicus is *credebatur sponte accusasse* (3.7.3).

24 Pliny had been closer to Arulenus Rusticus (see esp. *Ep.* 1.14.1) than to Herennius Senecio (cf. *Ep.* 7.33), but both had been *amici* (*Ep.* 3.11.3). The five letters on Regulus are 1.5, 2.20, 4.2 and 7, 6.2; shorter mentions in 1.20.14 and 2.11.22.

25 A third instance of divergent evaluations is provided by the brothers Domitius Tullus and Domitius Lucanus: Plin. *Ep.* 8.18 reveals the sordid reality behind Martial's praises of their fraternal concord (1.36, 5.28.3, 9.51).

26 On the dates of Pliny's letters about Regulus see the commentary of Sherwin-White 1966; note esp. 205 on the date of *Ep.* 2.20, sometimes wrongly considered Domitianic.

have been aware of them. We have to investigate the epigrams themselves to determine in how far such *covert* controversies provided the poet with his cue.

Regulus first appears in a pair of epigrams on his near-escape from a collapsing portico in one of his suburban villas (1.12 and 82). Both epigrams conclude with a pious *pointe*: the existence of the gods has been proved (1.12.12), and nobody can deny any longer that Regulus is a *cura deorum*, a care of the gods (1.82.10). The phrase *cura deorum* recurs in a further epigram from Book 1, but now with an objective rather than a subjective genitive: Regulus' care *for* the gods is as great as his wisdom, his piety as great as his talent, and for that reason he is a fitting recipient of a book and some incense (1.111)[27]. Elsewhere in Martial, gifts of incense are only mentioned in connection with the Saturnalia, and, as books were also commonly given on that occasion, the epigram may have originally accompanied a Saturnalian present[28]; if so, the solemn tone is all the more remarkable. But Pliny held little of Regulus' religiosity and spoke of "excessive superstition" (*Ep.* 6.2.2)[29]. So perhaps Martial's insistence on proof and evidence for the involvement of the gods was meant to counter this kind of objection[30].

The next cluster of epigrams for Regulus occurs in Book 5. In 5.10 he is represented as asking why living authors are less esteemed than dead ones; Martial answers that envy is the cause. The question suits Regulus, who once mocked Pliny for harking back to Cicero and not being content with the eloquence of his own times (*Ep.*

---

[27] The phrase *cura deorum* in 1.111.1 has been suspected of being an interpolation from 1.82.10, but it is rather a deliberate echo; cf. Citroni 1975: 342.

[28] Incense: 13.4, 4.46.7, 7.72.3; on books see p. 187. Incense and books are mentioned together as Saturnalian gifts of the poor to the rich at Luc. *Sat.* 16.

[29] Pliny also reported that Regulus frequented *haruspices* (2.20.4–5 and 13, 6.2.2), on which see Veyne 1967: 727–29.

[30] It is possible that Martial also responded to another criticism. Pliny adduces the *porticibus immensis* of another suburban villa of Regulus as a sign that he was *sumptuosus* (*Ep.* 4.2.5), and in general it was considered luxurious to construct porticoes for driving in (as Regulus did: 1.12.7–8, 1.82.4–5): cf. Juv. 7.178–81. So it might be significant that Martial calls Regulus' porticus *rudis* (1.12.5). However, the word here probably does not mean "rustic" or "primitive", but "in bad repair" (cf. 7.36.2); see Eden 1990: 160–61. Moreover, if Martial had wished to suggest modesty, he would have avoided to speak of *longas* ... *ruinas* (1.82.2).

1.5.11). This is the position which in Tacitus' *Dialogus* is defended by Aper, who has been called "a purified and sympathetic Regulus"[31]. Contemporary rhetorical controversy is also involved in 5.21, a mildly skoptic epigram on a rhetor who used to be unable to remember names, but by dint of "care" (*cura*) and "effort" (*labor*) found a solution: "he wrote them down and learnt them by heart" (*scripsit et edidicit*). These verbs recur in a remark of Pliny's about Regulus' speeches: "he wrote them down, although he could not learn them by heart" (*scribebat, quamuis non posset ediscere*: *Ep.* 6.2.2); elsewhere, Pliny bluntly declares that Regulus had "no memory" (*Ep.* 4.7.4). What Martial does, it seems, is to ridicule the effort of learning a speech by heart, hoping that this will be gratifying to Regulus, to whom the exercise was apparently uncongenial. Martial's implicit polemic may even extend to *cura* and *labor*, which Regulus cannot have valued very highly, because he, like other orators of his ilk, trusted to what Pliny called his "mad talent" (*ingenium insanum*: *ibid.*). Regulus represented a type of oratory which was fierce and unruly, and stood in opposition to the ideals of Pliny's teacher Quintilian and of Pliny himself[32]. Quintilian took up Cato's definition of the *orator* as a *uir bonus dicendi peritus* (*Inst.* 12.1.1); Regulus, according to a quip approvingly quoted by Pliny, was a *uir malus dicendi imperitus* (*Ep.* 4.7.5). But Martial, who in Book 10 was to praise "work" (*studium*) in Pliny (10.20 [19].15), in Book 5 went out of his way to praise, in an epigram addressed to someone else, "talent" (*ingenium*) in Regulus (5.63.4)[33].

Regulus' oratorical prowess is also vaunted in 6.38, set in the Basilica Julia in the Forum, the seat of the centumviral court, where Martial was later to locate the successes of Silius Italicus (7.63) and Pliny (10.20 [19]). Here, the focus is not on Regulus himself, but on his little son, not yet three years old, enjoying the applause earned by his father, and by that token showing the mettle of a true orator. It cannot have been usual to take infants into the Basilica Julia, and

---

[31] Syme 1958: 1.109.

[32] Pliny reports that he was taught by Quintilian at *Ep.* 2.14.9 and 6.6.3. On Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* as a reaction against the oratory of the political informers in general and of Regulus in particular see Winterbottom 1964.

[33] Other passages where Regulus' eloquence is mentioned in the course of an address to someone else (real or fictional) are 2.74.2–3, 4.16.6, and 5.28.6.

Regulus must have been a doting parent. Pliny, of course, disapproved, and could see only hypocrisy (*Ep.* 4.2.3) and, later, when the boy died, extravagance in mourning (*Ep.* 4.2 and 7). But Martial seized the opportunity of affirming yet another part of Regulus' self-image.

This opportunity was offered to Martial because he was present at the scene in the Basilica Julia. His epigram takes the form of an immediate reaction uttered on the spot, which may of course be a fiction, but the poem would hardly have had any authority if Martial had not indeed been an eye-witness. Apparently, he was among those whom Regulus "asked to come listen", in Pliny's phrase (*Ep.* 6.2.3), which would imply that he performed one of the most traditional duties of a client: that of accompanying his patron to the forum and showing vociferous approval of his speeches[34]. A similar reasoning can be applied to the poems on the collapsing portico, of which the first (1.12) employs the perspective of "there" and "then", but the second (1.82) is written from the point of view of someone who has just witnessed the collapse and is now staring in astonishment at the ruins. It is probable that Martial had been a guest at Regulus' villa at the time; in any case the reader is given that impression. The epigrams on the rescue as well as the one on the little boy were written from within a personal relationship with Regulus, which provided Martial with the communicatory context in which his utterances were appropriate. This applies also to those epigrams which are not occasioned by some event, but address Regulus in order to offer him a gift or to make a remark to him or to tell him an anecdote, because such poems too are only made possible by a pre-existing familiar communication. The gift in 1.111, the remark in 5.10 and the anecdote in 5.21 were keyed to Regulus' interests in such a way that an affirmatory function could be recognised. However, this is more difficult in the two poems for Regulus which still remain to be considered.

Both poems stand in Book 7 and both are on the topic of (material) exchange. In 7.31 Martial sends Regulus various foodstuffs with the comment that they are not home-grown, but bought in the market,

---

[34] Cf. e.g. Mart. 3.46, 6.48, 10.70. But also others than clients were engaged: cf. Plin. *Ep.* 2.14.4–9.

because Martial's small farm is not as productive as Regulus' estates. Of the latter, four are specified[35], so that a flattering element is certainly present, but the contrast with Martial's poverty turns the flattery into an indirect request for material support. That Martial used to receive such support appears from the other epigram for Regulus in Book 7:

> Aera domi non sunt. Superest hoc, Regule, solum
> ut tua uendamus munera: numquid emis? (7.16)

> I have no money in the house. The only thing left to me, Regulus, is to sell your gifts. Could it be that you're a buyer?

Even though Regulus' former gifts are mentioned, we cannot say that this poem is a contribution to his fame or reputation. The only information about Regulus it conveys is that Martial felt sufficiently close to him to permit himself a rather brazen joke. He had already joked with Regulus earlier, in a dedication of the second book (2.93), but more moderately. Since then, he has grown bolder, perhaps overbold: Regulus is absent from the subsequent books, and one possible explanation is that he resented Martial's lack of respect[36]. If so, he was less tolerant than many others among Martial's patrons, who received, among the poetry addressed to them, a rather greater proportion of not very serious verse.

Arruntius Stella is among those with whom Martial jokes about material exchange just as irreverently as with Regulus. An example is an epigram, also from Book 7 (36), in which Martial acknowledges the receipt of a gift of roof-tiles for his Nomentan farm, but then goes on to make etymological play with the word *tegula* (4): *Stella, tegis uillam, non tegis agricolam?* ("Stella, you cover the farmhouse; don't you want to cover the farmer?": 6). It is easy to recognise that Martial hints at another noun connected with *tegere*: *toga*. Such epigrams, in which Martial asks for more, are duly balanced by others, in which he offers less[37]. In Book 9, he tells Flaccus, a friend of Stella's, that he intends to give thrushes to both, but then starts

---

[35] Five, if Heinsius' *Calenus* for *colonus* in 9 is accepted.

[36] Alternatively, it may have been Martial who discontinued the relationship, perhaps under pressure from other patrons.

[37] Asking for more also in 1.44 (on which see p. 368), offering less also in 5.59 (at the Saturnalia).

thinking about it, and finally winds up with the conclusion that he will, after all, give thrushes to neither (9.55). From epigrams like these, it appears that Martial could take some liberties in his communication with Stella. But there are also epigrams which show Stella as an ambitious young politician, who gave sumptuous games after Domitian's return from the campaign against the Sarmatians in 93 (8.78), aspired to receive a consulate from Domitian (9.42), and finally got one from Trajan (12.2 [3]). This information is confirmed and supplemented by Statius, who in his epithalamium for Stella and his bride Violentilla also advertises hope of an early consulate, and justifies that hope by adducing marks of imperial favour already bestowed on Stella at the time of writing (in 90): membership in the college of the *XVuiri sacris faciundis* and the charge of organising the games held after Domitian's triumph over the Dacians in 89 (*Silv.* 1.2.174–81)[38]. Martial's poem on the wedding is very different: as a literary equivalent of the traditional *fescennina iocatio*, it teases the bridegroom with the necessity of giving up his wonted promiscuity (6.21)[39]. The indications of Stella's worldly status comes only from Book 8 onwards (8.78), and if Martial had died after publishing Book 7, we would have thirteen poems mentioning Stella or his wife, but not a single hint of a political career.

But from the first epigram for Stella onwards, his poetry is celebrated, more particularly his collection of love elegies called *Columba*, after a poem (or two poems) on the dove of his beloved Violentilla; this collection Martial flatteringly compares with Catullus' *Passer*, likewise named after poems on a mistress' bird[40]. Stella's

---

[38] On the date of the wedding and on Stella's career see pp. 211–212.

[39] On the background of this poem see the discussion of Statius' epithalamium at pp. 295–301.

[40] Stella is praised as a poet at 1.61.4, 5.59.2 (*diserte*), 6.21.1 (*uati*), 12.2 (3).11–14. In 7.14 Martial mentions a dirge on the death of Violentilla's *columba* (also singled out by Statius at *Silv.* 1.2.102), which he explicitly compares with Catul. 3, and in 1.7 he proclaims that Stella's *Columba* surpasses Catullus' *Passer*. It is generally believed that *Passer* here refers to Catul. 2 (or perhaps to Catul. 2 and 3 together), and that Stella also wrote a poem on the living bird (see Citroni 1975: 41–42). The latter hypothesis may conceivably be true, even though the former is, I think, false. There are two other passages in Martial in which *Passer* denotes Catullus' poetry (rather than the bird itself, as at 1.109.1): at 4.14 *Passer* must be the name of a book (or books) because it is compared with an offering of books by Martial himself (cf. p. 110); at 11.6, too, the gift of something comparable to

poetry also prominently figures in the epithalamium by Statius, who describes it as very popular[41]. That this is no mere flattery can be demonstrated from a passage in Pliny, who never deigns to address or even to mention Stella, and therefore seems not to have been a friend. Pliny once recommends a collection of his own verses, sent to a correspondent in the army, with the following words:

> Tu passerculis et columbulis nostris inter aquilas uestras dabis pennas, si tamen et tibi placebunt; si tantum sibi, continendos cauea nidoue curabis. (*Ep.* 9.25.3).
>
> You will let fly my little sparrows and little doves among your eagles, at least if they please you; if they please only themselves, you will see to it that they are held back in their cave or nest.

The sentence alludes to a passage in Virgil's *Bucolics* (9.11–13), where it is said that poetry is as powerless against military force as doves are against eagles, but the addition of *passerculis*, which clearly refers to the poetry of Catullus, makes it all but certain that *columbulis* is meant not only to recall the passage in Virgil, but also to refer to the poetry of Stella[42]. Pliny characterises his own verse as being in the tradition of Catullus and Stella and asks his addressee to circulate it "among the military standards" (playing with the double meaning of *aquila*, "eagle"), or else to keep it "in the bookcase" (playing with the double meaning of *nidus*, "nest")[43]. In the same

---

self (cf. p. 110); at 11.6, too, the gift of something comparable to Catullus' *Passer* should not refer to a poem (L. Friedländer 1886: 2.171) or "some poems" (Kay 1985: 75), but to a book (Birt 1882: 407), viz. Book 11 itself. Thus Martial's comparison between the *Columba* and the *Passer* is a comparison between collections. Because Statius unequivocally describes Stella as an author of elegy (*Silv.* 1.2.7–10, 250–55), I would suppose that Stella's collection was elegiac throughout and that the poem (or poems) on Violentilla's dove was (or were) not in hendecasyllables, as conventionally assumed, but in elegiacs, like Ovid's emulation of Catul. 3 (but not Catul. 2) in *Am.* 2.6. Pliny's comparison of his own book with both the *Passer* and the *Columba* at *Ep.* 9.25.3 would then be in accordance with its being *uarius ... metris* (*Ep.* 8.21.4; cf. Sherwin-White 1966: 474). On Stella's poetry see further p. 300.

41 See *Silv.* 1.2.172–73; also 197–99, if in 197 *uatis* is kept, as by Courtney 1990.

42 The allusion to Virgil was recognised by E.A. Schmidt 1972: 20, the reference to Stella by Buchheit 1977.

43 The word *nidus* could denote a "pigeon-hole" to put papyrus rolls in: see Mart. 1.117.15 and 7.17.5, and cf. Birt 1907: 245–46. Birt 1913: 340, followed by Wendel

context Pliny talks of his hopes to achieve *gloria* with his poetry (2): it appears that Stella had already done so. So the emphasis in Martial and Statius is not surprising: Stella set greater store by his identity as a poet than by his identity as a statesman, just as Silius Italicus and Pliny did, or at least were tempted to do.

The other theme of Martial's epigrams on Stella, alongside poetry, is wealth, or rather the display of wealth, as in a pair of epigrams from Book 5[44]. In the first (5.11) Martial tells Severus that Stella wears sardonyxes, emeralds, diamonds, and jaspers on a single finger joint, in the second (5.12) Martial belittles the feats of strongmen who lift six or seven boys, because Stella on a single finger bears ten girls. The only explanation which makes sense of these "girls" is that they were pictures engraved in gems or perhaps in one single gem[45]. Elsewhere (11.59), Martial mocks someone who wears many rings for being ostentatious, and moralists like Seneca, Pliny the Elder, and Juvenal criticise the wearing both of many rings and of rings with fancy stones[46]. So Stella was not afraid of offending more sober sensibilities by flaunting a luxurious life-style. Tacitus, in a well known excursus (*Ann.* 3.55), stated that luxury had declined under the Flavians, among other reasons because new senators "from the *municipia* and the *coloniae* and even from the provinces" had brought with them "the parsimony of their homes" (3). Now Stella hailed from the *municipium* of Patavium (Padua), a town noted for the se-

---

1943: 272, n.21, recognises the same wordplay as I recognise here in Claudian *Carm. min.* 19.7 and Jerome *Ep.* 47.3; it also occurs in Aus. *Praef.* (I Green) 4.14–15.The verb *continere* also has a double meaning, as it often refers to withholding a book from publication; see p. 279 with n. 85.

[44] On Stella's wealth cf. Sartori 1985: 203–07, who speculates on the basis of Mart. 7.36 (see above, p. 155) that it may have derived from brick production.

[45] These pictures will have represented the nine Muses together with another *puella*, perhaps Violentilla (L. Friedländer 1886: 1.392) or Minerva (King as reported by Friedländer, *ibid.*; for Minerva as the tenth Muse see Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.20, 1.6.1–2, 5.3.91), or Elegy (Merli 1996b: 1.439, n. 22, who compares Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.3–10 for *Elegea* as the tenth muse). Gessler 1946: 58–60 suggested that Martial's meaning was that Stella had many girl-friends, but Durand 1946: 259–61 rightly objected that this does not account for the theme of "lifting" and "bearing" and moreover severs the connection with the preceding poem, clearly established by the echo of *uno ... in articulo* (5.11.1–2) in *uno ... digito* (5.12.6).

[46] Sen. *Nat.* 7.31, Plin. *Nat.* 33.24–25, Juv. 1.26–30; see further Blümner 1911: 259–60.

verity of its morals, but apparently he did not quite fit Tacitus' generalisation[47]. Yet the context of what I have just called "flaunting" should be kept in mind. The fact that the exact reference of the "girls" remains obscure suggests that the pair of epigrams originated as an improvisation on an occasion where the audience (including the Severus addressed in the first of the two epigrams) had Stella's rings before their eyes; the jocular tone suggests that that occasion was a symposium[48]. Rather than conveying calculated praise Martial may have been contributing to the high spirits at a symposium by teasing Stella with his extravagance, in other words performing a communication that was appropriate under the circumstances. Yet the poems, in which Stella's name is mentioned, were also published, and this implies that it cannot have been unwelcome to Stella that his life-style was advertised in the pages of Martial.

An even more telling example of Martial's selection of topics is provided by his epigrams for Domitius Apollinaris. Because we have the good fortune to know something about Apollinaris from epigraphical sources and from Pliny, we are able to put Martial's poems in perspective[49]. The most instructive poem in this respect is 10.12, where Martial addresses a certain Domitius, who, after hard work at Rome, is about to spend the late summer at *Apollineas Vercellas* (1); the poem, being from Book 10, must date from the years 95–98. External information will make it possible to be more precise about both addressee and date. We know that Domitius Apollinaris was from Vercellae (modern Vercelli) in Northwest Italy, so that it transpires that the Domitius of the poem is to be identified with Apollinaris (and that the epithet given to the town is an allusion to the *cog-*

---

[47] That Stella's *patria* was Patavium appears from Mart. 1.61.3–4; the town's reputation for strict morals, at least among the womenfolk, is on record at Mart. 11.16.7–8 and Plin. *Ep.* 1.14.6. Other references to Stella's conspicuous consumption in Martial are 7.15 and 50 (a *tempietto* in his garden) and 11.52.15 (luxury of the table).

[48] The possibility that (pairs of) epigrams on *objets d'art* go back to improvisation, specifically convivial improvisation, is discussed at pp. 102–104, the possibility that "isolated vocatives" (such as *Seuere* in 5.11.2) have that same background at p. 45–47.

[49] Domitius Apollinaris receives *Ep.* 2.9 and 5.6 from Pliny and is mentioned at *Ep.* 9.13.13. The epigraphical material is presented and correlated with the evidence from Pliny and Martial by Balland 1981: 103–20 and Syme 1991c: 588–602.

nomen[50]). We also know that Domitius Apollinaris was governor of the province of Lycia-Pamphylia from 93–96, which rules out a date in 95 or 96. A date in 98 is unlikely, because in the summer of that year Martial was preparing his return to Spain; in this poem, however, he is looking forward to welcoming Domitius back after the (late) summer is over, without so much as hinting at his own impending departure. That leaves us with 97, the year in which, according to the *Fasti Ostienses*, Domitius Apollinaris was consul from the first of July to the first of September. So "the city's yoke" from which Domitius will "relieve his neck" (6) is nothing less than the consulate. The interesting point, of course, is that this is not stated by Martial, who neither expands on the character of the office nor on Domitius' way of exercising it, but takes for his theme the sun-tan that Domitius will acquire in the country and (alas!) quickly lose once back in Rome. Martial's aim in this poem clearly is not to commemorate a consul, but to say goodbye to a friend.

The other poems to Apollinaris confirm and extend this pattern. On one occasion, Martial sends Apollinaris a garland of roses:

> I, felix rosa, mollibusque sertis
> nostri cinge comas Apollinaris;
> quas tu nectere candidas, sed olim,
> sic te semper amet Venus, memento. (7.89)

> Go, lucky rose, and with a soft garland circle the hairs of my dear Apollinaris. And when those hairs are grey (long hereafter), remember to bind them still. So may Venus always love you.

The reference to Venus may imply that the occasion was a wedding (or the return of a wedding day), but if so, there is no praise of the husband and not even a mention of the wife[51]. Even if the occasion

[50] But Martial could not have called Vercellae *Apollineas* just on account of Apollinaris. Apollo must have been important in the neighbourhood, as seems indicated by Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.58–59 (on Turin); cf. Vollmer 1898: 288–89 (and Henderson 1998: 20–22).

[51] One might compare 4.13, a wedding poem combining the motifs of Venus and old age. Syme 1991c: 593 suggested that 7.89 might have been written on the occasion of a second marriage of Apollinaris; I do not think that the case for a second marriage is established, and have therefore added as a further possibility the return of a wedding day (it would have been the twentieth, as the poem is from 92 and Apolli-

should have been of another kind (e.g. a birthday), the absence of a laudatory intention remains: the poem is primarily concerned with the gift itself and the good wishes that accompany it. Of the four further poems for Apollinaris, three are dedications: of Book 4 (4.86), Book 7 (7.26) and Book 11 (11.15). In two of these poems (4.86 and 7.26) Martial openly states that he has selected Apollinaris as his dedicatee because the latter's judgement carries great weight with the cognoscenti, and in the third poem (11.15) a similar motive can be discerned, because Martial there suggests to Apollinaris a line of defence to be adopted against possible criticism. So the interested party in these dedications is not so much Apollinaris, even though he is praised as a man of taste and learning, but Martial himself, who enlists a powerful supporter in his struggle for a favourable reception. Finally, there is a long epigram (10.30) on a villa of Apollinaris at Formiae (Formia), in a manner reminiscent of Statius' *Silvae*: Apollinaris' other villas are enumerated (5–10)[52], ease and comfort are characterised in near-paradoxical turns of phrase (11–18), and independence of, and even victory over, the forces of nature is emphasised (19–24). But Martial ends in his own, epigrammatic, manner, by exclaiming that Rome does not allow many days at Formiae: the amenities of the place are enjoyed more by the bailiff and the janitor than by the master (25–29). This picks up the beginning of the poem, where Apollinaris was shown as fatigued from "restless cares" (3), and both passages together of course indirectly compliment Apollinaris on his political activity at Rome (10.30, like 10.12 should date from around the time of Apollinaris' consulate). But that activity is not specified, and the poem is in the first place a celebration of Apollinaris' wealth and lifestyle.

The poems to Faustinus, one of Martial's most frequent addressees, show a pattern very similar to that of the poems for Apollinaris. There is no mention of a career, but Martial deplores that Rome takes up days that Faustinus would rather have spent at his villa at

---

naris' eldest son was born around 73). For celebrations of the return of wedding days see 10.38 and perhaps 7.74.

[52] Martial's formulation *need* not mean that that Apollinaris owned villas at all the resorts mentioned, but such an interpretation is strengthened by a passage in a letter by Pliny to Apollinaris, also on the subject of villas: *Ep.* 5.6.45; cf. Sherwin-White 1966: 329–30.

Anxur (Terracina) (10.51.5–6)[53]. It is conceivable that Faustinus, like Apollinaris, was detained in the capital by the obligations of a senator (in that case he could be identified with Minicius Faustinus, *suff.* 91), but one may also think of commercial activities and see in Faustinus a representative of the type of cultured equestrian magnate also to be found in Statius' *Silvae*. However that may be, Faustinus, like Apollinaris, appears in Martial's pages principally as an owner of villas and as a literary authority.

Of the epigrams on villas, only one (3.58) contains a long description, but even this description is part of some kind of playful communication with Faustinus: the poem forms a pair with 3.47, where Martial addresses Faustinus to make fun of the sterile suburban retreat of a certain Bassus; in 3.58, he then addresses Bassus to praise the fertile farm of Faustinus at Baiae[54]. The other epigrams on villas are even more strongly embedded in private communication: Martial exhorts Faustinus to leave for Trebula (5.71), is sorry for him that he has had insufficient time to enjoy himself at Anxur (10.51), and once announces his own arrival at Tibur (4.57). Martial appears to have been a welcome guest at Faustinus' villas, and to have reciprocated the hospitality by directly or indirectly celebrating his host's possessions. But he could also take up other occasions that offered in the course of his stays: thus, the two epigrams on the death of the young daughter of a neighbour of Faustinus (1.114 and 1.116) probably concern a neighbour not at Rome, but at Tibur[55].

Faustinus' literary authority is invoked in dedicatory poems, in which he is asked to defend Martial's book against criticisms (3.2) or to decide whether the book should be published at all (4.10). He is also the recipient of a statement that abusive epigrams circulating under Martial's name are not authentic (7.12), which likewise involves his literary authority, because Martial implicitly suggests to Faustinus that he actively engage in combating false ascriptions. Faustinus was an author, quite possibly a poet, himself (1.25), and he

53 The possibility should be noted that 10.51 was addressed, not to Faustinus, but to Frontinus; see p. 68 with n.98.

54 This is a paradox, because villas at Baiae were normally built for pleasure, not agriculture; see Stärk 1995: 144–45.

55 See Howell 1980: 343 (with due caution).

must have been pleased that Martial affirmed and advertised this part of his identity by publicly communicating with him about poetry.

Faustinus' "literary" identity is also relevant for a third group of poems addressed to him, skoptic epigrams where he occurs in the "isolated vocative"[56]. Martial tells him jokes, about a rhetor (3.25), a one-eyed woman (3.39), a miser (5.32)[57], an adulteress (6.7), or a doctor (6.53), and therewith performs the function of entertaining his patron. But he enhances the joke by couching it in poetic form, thus making it into an artistic object, which can be admired as such, and which is connected with the name of Faustinus. So we have communication between Martial and Faustinus, but communication taken out of the transitory flow of ordinary verbal exchange and given permanence and value (even if only in the medium of epigram). To characterise this common mode of functioning of poetry for patrons, we might speak of "enhanced communication".

The relationship to which this term best applies is the one Martial entertained with Flaccus. Flaccus is the person most frequently addressed in the *Epigrams*, and he was evidently a rich man, in whom Martial saw a fitting recipient of his fantasies on the return of Maecenas (8.55 [56])[58]. Yet there is virtually no panegyric in all the many epigrams that Martial addresses to him. A career or other occupations are not mentioned, apart from a voyage to Cyprus (8.45, 9.90), of which we cannot guess whether it was undertaken in some political capacity or in the context of commercial activities or perhaps for purely private reasons. There are not even descriptions of villas, although Martial seems to be in Baiae with Flaccus on two occasions (1.59, 11.80). Instead, the epigrams for Flaccus consist almost exclusively in banter, sometimes on economic themes (Martial contrasting his own poverty with Flaccus' wealth), but mostly on erotic ones: Flaccus receives a number of skoptic epigrams (where Flaccus appears in the isolated vocative) with explicit sexual content and also a number of epigrams fantasising on the appearance and behaviour of

[56] On the "isolated vocative" see p. 45–47.

[57] Not a spendthrift: see Burnikel 1980: 101–05, who gives a good analysis of the relation between this epigram and Lucill. *AP* 11.171. Of the skoptic epigrams addressed to Faustinus, also 6.53 is an adaptation of a model in Lucillius (*AP* 11.257): Burnikel 1980: 54–64.

[58] For a detailed argument about the identity of Flaccus see pp. 59 and 69.

the ideal sex object, whether woman or boy[59]. Apparently Flaccus did not greatly care to be honoured in poetry, but enjoyed witty and spicy communication in poetic form.

Martial's unbuttoned familiarity with Flaccus is on the other end of the scale from the reverent homage paid to Silius Italicus, yet the consideration of further figures (Regulus, Stella, Apollinaris, Faustinus) has shown that the scale is a gliding one. It is true that there are considerable differences in Martial's treatment of these various patrons: in the amount of attention paid to politics, poetry or villas, in the respective shares of seriousness and jest, and in the degree of intimacy obtaining between poet and patron. But this very differentiation means that the image of the patron conveyed by the *Epigrams* is always dependent on the kind of *relationship* that Martial entertains with him, i.e. not on the patron alone, but on the interaction between patron and poet. The various utterances of the poet, whether panegyrical or jocular, are always embedded in an ongoing communication with the patron, and it is this communication, rather than a mere portrait of the patron, that the *Epigrams* present to the reader.

This communicatory character of Martial's poetry for patrons explains the frequent use made of standard occasions, such as weddings and funerals, which entailed institutionalised communicatory acts, such as congratulating or consoling. Among the sample of poetry for patrons discussed in this section, we have found poems on the death of the son of Silius Italicus (9.86), the rescue of Regulus (1.12 and 82), the wedding of Stella (6.21) and perhaps of Apollinaris (7.89), the departure of Apollinaris for the country (10.12), and the death of the daughter of a neighbour of Faustinus (1.114 and 116). What is striking about this list is the irregular, one is almost tempted to say haphazard, distribution of the various types over the patrons. Even if some of them did not get married or had no great loss to mourn during the years covered by the *Epigrams*, Apollinaris cannot have been the only one to have spent a few months in the country. And all of them certainly celebrated their birthday every year, but none receives a birthday poem, although Martial did write

[59] Banter on economic themes: 1.59, 1.76, 8.55 (56), 9.55, 12.74; skoptic epigrams with sexual content: 7.82, 9.33, 11.95 and 98; fantasies: 1.57, 11.27, 11.100 (cf. 101) (woman) 4.47 (boy). Flaccus' interest in both women and boys is also in evidence at 9.90.7–8.

such poems for others[60]. Now it is of course possible that Martial yearly wrote an anniversary epigram for all his patrons without normally including these compositions in his published books, but a more reasonable hypothesis is that he gave poetic form to his participation in the birthday ceremonies of his patrons only when there was some specific impulse to do so[61]. This impulse may have come from himself as well as from the patron. An indication for the latter situation may be found in those poems where the birthday is not the patron's, but that of some person close to the patron: thus Martial celebrates the birthday of the father of Marcellinus (3.6), the little son of Parthenius (4.45), the wife of Rufus, whose birthday coincided with that of the emperor (9.39), and he commemorates the birthdays of Lucan, the deceased husband of Argentaria Polla (7.21–23) and of Virgil, the admired model of Silius Italicus (12.67). In all these cases a request from the patron can be reasonably suspected. A poem would enhance the ceremony, when it was performed, and advertise the devotion of the celebrant, when it was subsequently published. So we find that neither party was interested in complete coverage of all possibly relevant occasions, but that both could actualise the potential for poetic communication inherent in these occasions, if it suited their purposes.

Another aspect of the communicatory character of Martial's poetry for patrons is that not all the utterances he addresses to a certain patron need to be laudatory or even serious. We have seen that many epigrams amuse the patron by telling him a joke at someone else's expense, and that some patrons even become the object of gentle jesting themselves. One striking illustration may be added to those already given. The last poem in Book 12, and thus of the *Epigrams* as a whole, is a compliment to Instanius Rufus, who is to succeed Macer as the governor of Baetica (12.98)—but a few poems earlier, we encounter the same Instanius Rufus as a reader of pornographic literature, who is urged by Martial to have his girl with him as he

[60] See, apart from the poems to be mentioned below: 4.1 (the emperor), 9.52 and 53 (Q. Ovidius), 10.23 (M. Antonius Primus), 10.87 (Restitutus).

[61] It must remain open, I think, in how far Martial participated at all. Argetsinger 1992 argues that a client had an obligation of celebrating his patron's birthday, but the texts she cites all concern especially affectionate relationships; thus Mart. 9.52, on his close friend Q. Ovidius (who was not a patron: see p. 71).

reads, in order not to have to take recourse to masturbation (12.95). The question needs to be asked what the publication of such epigrams meant for the functions Martial's poetry could perform for the patron[62]. And even if the patron did not receive such frivolous verses himself, the poems in which he was honoured were surrounded by all kinds of humorous, satiric, and even obscene epigrams, which make up the large majority in Martial's books. Thus, the two serious and reverential poems on Silius Italicus' acquisition of the tomb of Virgil (11.48 and 50 [49]) are preceded by an epigram on a practiser of cunnilinctus (11.47) and followed by one on a man with enormous genitals (11.51); in between is an epigram on a rapacious courtesan, with a *pointe* involving fellatio (11.49 [50]). So the further question arises how the functions for the patron were affected by this kind of contextualisation. In order to answer these questions we need a wider perspective.

Panegyric and Carnivalisation

The functions of Martial's epigrams can only be properly understood if due account is taken of the role played by two very specific reception situations: the symposium and the Saturnalia[63]. It has been argued in Chapter Two that Martial sometimes improvised or recited epigrams at the symposia of his patrons, and moreover that the reception of his published books by the public at large often occurred at symposia[64]. It has also been noted that at least Books 4, 5, 7, 10 (first edition), 11, and 12 were published on the Saturnalia, and that Book 8 may probably added to the list; all other books *may* have

---

[62] Because the poem occurs at the very end of Book 12, we cannot be quite certain that it is not a posthumous addition from material which Martial himself had not intended for publication (cf. p.116 with n. 86). But because we have seen that Martial often takes liberties with his patrons, the issue is not of great moment.

[63] The symposium and the Saturnalia are discussed together by Gowers 1993: 24–32, but as the setting or theme of literary works, not as their reception situation; cf. Nauta 1987: 79, n. 35.

[64] Symposium as locus of performance by Martial: pp. 96–105; as locus of reception of the published book: p. 139.

been published on the Saturnalia, although there is no proof[65]. But even if Martial did not *always* publish at the Saturnalia, he apparently considered the festival an occasion which was particularly well adapted to the reception of his work.

Martial gives his reasons for this assessment most fully in Book 11, where he legitimises the high proportion of obscene epigrams in the book with the unrestrained licence reigning at the Saturnalia[66]. However, in one book published at the Saturnalia, Book 5, Martial chose not to exploit that licence out of regard for the puritan tastes of the emperor, and notified his readers in advance that obscenity should not be expected (5.2)[67]. Nevertheless, the book "jokes" (*iocatur*) with the emperor (5.2.6) and consists of *ioci*, "jokes", just as did the preceding four, more lascivious, books (5.15.1; cf. 5.2.5)[68]. It is this jocosity, even if present only in attenuated form, which makes the book suitable for reception at the Saturnalia. Martial himself paraphrases the festival as "the jokes of December" (*iocos Decembris*: 10.87.7), and repeatedly argues that it is a fitting occasion to read his epigrams, because these are *ioci* in poetic form[69]. This connects the Saturnalia with the symposium, which is likewise a context

---

[65] See p. 111 (Books 4, 5, 7, 10[1], 11), p. 126 with n. 115 (Book 12), p. 130 with n. 128 (Book 8). Sullivan 1991: 319 dates Books 2 and 6 as well to the Saturnalia, without argument, but perhaps on account of 2.85 and 6.24. See Appendix for a survey of the dates of all the books.

[66] See esp. 11.15, but cf. also 11.2 and 11.6.

[67] After Domitian's death, Martial rejoices that such restraint is no longer necessary: *Clamant ecce mei "Io Saturnalia" uersus:/ et licet et sub te praeside, Nerua, libet* (11.2.5–6).

[68] Similarly in Book 8, which probably was not published on the Saturnalia, Martial shows his devotion for the emperor by renouncing obscenity without renouncing *ioci* (8.*ep.*).

[69] On Martial's use of *ioci* for his epigrams see Grewing 1997: 529; these *ioci* on the Saturnalia: 4.14, 7.28, 10.18 (17); cf. also 5.30, where poems sent at the Saturnalia are said to be offered *mense suo* (6). Similarly, Statius invokes *Iocus* and *Sales* together with Saturn (as lord of the Saturnalia) at the beginning of *Silv.* 1.6 (1–8). *Silv.* 4.9, a poem written in answer to a Saturnalian *iocus* by the addressee (1), is characterised as *hendecasyllabi iocosi* in the title (cf. pp. 270–272 on authenticity) and as *hendecasyllabos quos Saturnalibus una risimus* in the preface (4.*ep.* 23–24).

for *ioci* in general (10.48.21) and for Martial's poetic *ioci* in particular (4.8)[70].

Apart from the Saturnalia and the symposium, there are other social institutions at which *ioci* are not only admitted but even required. Two of these are adduced by Martial in what was originally the second poem of his first book with mixed epigrams (1.4), where he attempts to convince the emperor of the innocuousness of his poems. His first comparison (3–4) is with the triumph, where the emperor himself becomes the butt of the *ioci* of his soldiers (as he does not in Martial's epigrams)[71]; the second comparison (5–6) is with mime, a popular kind of comedy, or rather farce, of an often bawdy character, which Domitian liked to watch[72]. In the preface (1.*ep.*) Martial adds a third comparison: here he compares his *ioci* (5) with the Floralia (14–21), paraphrased as "the sweet rites of jocular Flora" (*iocosae dulce ... sacrum Florae*: 18); at this festival mimes were staged, and at the end the female players performed a striptease act, for which our sources use the word *ioci*[73]. Like the Saturnalia and the symposium, these institutions challenge the monopoly of seriousness and self-control, and bid defiance to the self-appointed champions of that monopoly, who are represented in Martial by Cato Uticensis and other traditional Republican worthies. Cato occurs in connection with all the institutions mentioned above (apart from the triumph): he should not disturb the enjoyment of Martial's epigrams in the way he once disturbed the Floralia (1.*ep.*); *even he* would have enjoyed mime when performed by Latinus (9.28); *even he* would have read Martial's verses at the symposium (10.20 [19]); but he is

---

[70] There are many other passages where the symposium is associated with *ioci* or more generally with laughter, e.g. Mart. 2.41.16, Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.13, Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.28, Plin. *Pan.* 49.8. See further below, pp. 173–180.

[71] Cf. also 7.8.9–10. For the word *ioci* used in the context of the ritual mockery of the triumphator see *ThLL* 7.2.287.66–74.

[72] Other comparisons with mime: 3.86.4, 8.*ep.*12–13. For Domitian's interest in mime (and especially in the mime-actor Latinus) cf. also Mart. 9.28, Suet. *Dom.* 15.3, and Schol. Juv. 4.53 (from Marius Maximus). On mime under the Empire see L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.113–118.

[73] V. Max. 2.10.8, Sen. *Ep.* 97.8; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.183, 332. Martial again alludes to the Floralia at 1.35.8, in a defence of his *carminibus ... iocosis* (10).

to keep away when these verses celebrate the Saturnalia (11.2)[74]. Apparently, Martial believes that all these festive occasions share features with each other which they also share with his epigrams, but it should be borne in mind that the Floralia and the mime (as also the triumph) only provide models or analogies for the reception of the epigrams, but were not reception situations themselves. For that reason I will not further consider them here[75].

The symposium and the Saturnalia are related to each other by more than a receptiveness to *ioci*. The relationship is complex, because it is at the same time one of inclusion and one of similarity. The relationship is one of *inclusion* because the celebration of the Saturnalia largely took place at symposia[76]. But at the Saturnalia, drunkenness seems to have been rife all day, not only at the nightly drinking parties[77], and in this respect, therefore, the relationship was one of *similarity*. The combination of the two relationships can be well illustrated from the role of the *synthesis*. This was an easy-fitting garment which was worn at symposia instead of the cumbrous toga; at the Saturnalia, it was worn not only at dinner, but during the entire festival, as appears from the following distich[78]:

Nil lasciuius est Carisiano:
Saturnalibus ambulat togatus. (6.24)

---

[74] In 11.2 Cato is mentioned together with Fabricius, in 9.28 with Fabricius and Curius; the latter pair occurs in similar contexts in 7.68 and 11.16. On Cato as the proverbial killjoy see Citroni 1975: 11.

[75] For some short remarks cf. Richlin 1992: 9–12 (and 274–75) and Sullivan 1991: 65–69.

[76] On the meaning in which I use the word "symposium" see p. 97, n. 19. The role of the symposium at the Saturnalia is most fully documented in Luc. *Sat.* and *Ep. Sat.*, but also elsewhere in the voluminous but scattered evidence, which was collected and interpreted by Wissowa 1909–15: 436–40 and Nilsson 1921. A comprehensive modern treatment of the Saturnalia and its presiding deity, Saturn, is to be found in Versnel 1993: 123–227.

[77] At least that is the suggestion of such phrases as *ebria* bruma (Mart. 13.1.4), *madidis diebus* (Mart. 14.1.9), and *ebrio ac uomitante populo* (Sen. *Ep.* 18.4). Other passages on Saturnalian drunkenness, however, assume the context of the symposium (Mart. 11.6, Tac. *Ann.* 13.15.2, Luc. *Sat.* and *Ep. Sat. passim*). Hor. *S.* 2.3.4–5, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.5, and Juv. 7.97 allow of no inference.

[78] For the *synthesis* as a dinner dress see Mart. 5.79; cf. further the article "Synthesis" in *RE* II.4 (1932), 1459–61 (Schuppe). That it was worn during the entire festival appears also from Mart. 14.142 (141); cf. 14.1.1.

> Nothing is more lewd than Carisianus: at the Saturnalia, he walks around in the toga.

Apparently, "Carisianus" was a grave person who was not prepared to take off his toga[79]; Martial jestingly suggests that this made not a sober, but a "lewd" impression, because the only persons who fittingly wore the toga on the Saturnalia were prostitutes and convicted adulteresses, for whom this dress was prescribed[80]. Normally, the *toga* as worn by a man would have quite different connotations: it was the Roman national dress, in which all serious business was conducted. Its replacement, on the Saturnalia, by the *synthesis* temporarily suspended all that it stood for.

Other markers of the suspension of the normal order also connect the Saturnalia with the symposium. During the festival, a ruler was appointed, mostly by lot (so that all had equal chances), and called by the title of *rex*, "king", which distanced him from the normal structures of Roman government[81]. Rome had become a republic by the expulsion of the last king many centuries ago, and it had remained a republic, at least in theory, under the rule of the emperors, who normally avoided the appellation *rex*, so that that word became available for various kind of "unofficial" rulers; another example relevant to the present study is its use for mighty patrons[82]. Although the Saturnalian "king" has often been compared with the Lord of

---

[79] Persons with philosophical aspirations might be tempted to leave the toga on: Sen. *Ep.* 18.2: *libenter tecum conferrem quid existimares esse faciendum* (on the Saturnalia) ... *an exuendam togam.*

[80] See the references in Grewing 1997: 191 (who unconvincingly suggests that "Carisianus" really was a woman). Mart. 2.39 is a similar joke, but with a different thrust (hinting at effeminacy); likewise Cic. *Phil* 2.44.

[81] See Tac. *Ann.* 13.15.2 (*regnum*, assigned by lot), Arr. *Epict.* 1.25.8 (βασιλεύς, mode of election not specified), Luc. *Sat.* 4 (βασιλεύς, appointed by dicing) and 9 (βασιλεύς, elected by voting (χειροτονεῖν; cf. 2: ἄρχοντας καθίστασθαι). Mart. 11.6.2: *regnator quibus imperat fritillus* (said of the Saturnalia) may also contain an allusion to the practice of appointing a *rex* by dicing. The designation *Saturnalicius princeps* in Sen. *Apoc.* 8.2 looks like an *ad hoc* coinage to suit Claudius; cf. Nauta 1987: 85 with n. 51.

[82] On *rex* applied to mighty patrons see p. 16, on the avoidance of the word by emperors see Wickert 1954: 2108–18. The point of the title *rex* for the Saturnalian "king" disappears in Greek, because the inevitable translation was βασιλεύς (cf. the previous note), which was also a common designation of the emperor.

Misrule or Carnival Prince of later times, the ancient evidence makes it all but certain that his rule was limited to the symposium, where his function was to promote laughter by giving all kinds of ridiculous orders to the guests, such as shouting something shameful about oneself or dancing naked, and to decree equally ridiculous penalties for failure to comply, such as having one's face smeared with soot and being thrown into cold water[83]. The Saturnalian "king" is thus not very different from the master of the revels at "ordinary" (i.e. non-Saturnalian) symposia, who could also be appointed by lot and could also be called *rex* (although other names were common as well)[84]. His functions are discussed in a chapter (1.4) of the *Quaestiones convivales* of Plutarch, who stresses the responsibility for the proper mixture of seriousness and play[85]. In that context there is also mention of "orders", which can (but need not) be intended to make their receiver ridiculous, as well as of "penalties", but in Plutarch both are issued by the guests themselves, and all the symposiarch can do is to exercise a moderating influence[86]. So it looks as if the Saturnalian "king" is in a sense a radicalisation of the "king" at ordinary banquets, having a wider jurisdiction and being less restricted by

---

[83] The instructions given by the βασιλεύς in Arr. *Epict.* 1.25.8 and Luc. *Sat.* 4 (from which I have been paraphrasing, incorporating a detail from 2) presuppose the symposium; in Luc. *Sat.* 4 these instructions are explicitly called γελοῖα. In Tac. *Ann.* 13.15.2 the setting for Nero's Saturnalian *regnum* appears from the context: *conuictus ... temulentos, ... nox et lasciuia*; Nero's aim in ordering Britannicus to sing a song is to cause *inrisus*.

[84] *Rex* (or *regnum*) is found at Hor. *C.* 1.4.18 (where *regna uini* are bestowed by the dice) and repeatedly in Late Antiquity, e.g. at Prud. *Cath.* 9.30, Macr. *Sat.* 1.5.13, 1.7.12, 2.1.3, Sidon. Apoll. *Ep.* 9.13.4, and in the mock-law appended to the *Querolus* (Petr., etc., ed. Bücheler–Heraeus[6], 267.2 and 17); at Juv. 5.130 *dicat regi "bibe"* the primary meaning of *rex* is "patron" (as at 14, 137, 161), but the context suggests an allusion to the meaning "master of the banquet". Other names include *magister* (Var. *apud* Non. p. 142 M., Cic. *Sen.* 46, Macr. *Sat.* 2.8.5), and *arbiter* (Macr. *ibid.*, Hor. *C.* 2.7.25).

[85] Plu. *Quaest. conv.* 620a–622b. Plutarch's term is normally συμποσίαρχος or ἄρχων, which are also the common terms elsewhere; once he speaks of the συμποσίου βασιλεύς, but that is in a comparison with the τῶν Ἀσσυρίων βασιλεύς (622a).

[86] *Quaest. conv.* 621e–622a. Plutarch's terms are προστάγματα and ζημία; in Saturnalian contexts (see above, n. 83), Lucian uses ἐπιτάγματα (and ἐπιτάττειν) and ἐπιτίμιον, whereas Epictetus has προστάσσειν.

considerations about appropriateness and due measure; it is certainly not accidental that he is more uniformly called by the title of *rex* than his non-Saturnalian counterpart.

Apart from kingship, another, related, political institution was taken over both at the Saturnalia and at the symposium: law-giving. At the symposium, the drinking often took place according to certain rules, determining in what proportions the wine should be mixed with water, what system of toasting should be observed, what entertainments the guests or the host should provide, etc.; these rules were called "laws" (*leges*, νόμοι)[87]. They could be taken very seriously, as appears from the fact that various philosophers composed works laying down the "sympotic laws" (νόμοι συμποτικοί) to be followed in their schools; of course this cried out for parody, and indeed we hear of a courtesan writing a similar work on the desired convivial behaviour in *her* establishment[88]. At Rome such parodies are especially associated with the Saturnalia. An example is the so-called *Lex Tappula*, of which only the prescript has been preserved, containing a dating formula pointing to the Saturnalia[89]. The text itself is from the second century B.C.E., but it has been preserved on a bronze stele erected probably at the end of the first century C.E., i.e. in the time of Martial, in a house at Vercellae (modern Vercelli), which could just conceivably have belonged to Domitius Apollinaris, dedicatee of three of Martial's Saturnalian books[90].

There also existed more modern texts with Saturnalian laws. Ovid, when he lists various types of works specifically composed for the Saturnalia, includes books giving "laws" (*leges*) to banquets (*Tr.* 2.488–91), and Lucian, in the section *Cronosolon* of his *Saturnalia* (10–18), gives us an example of such "laws". Lucian, however, does

[87] For *lex* in this sense see *ThLL* 7.2.1247.47–61; for νόμος cf. Lucil. *AP* 11.10, and see below.

[88] See Ath. 1.3f (where the reading and the meaning are uncertain), 5.186b, 13.585b (where the parody by the courtesan is mentioned); cf. Plu. *Quaest. conv.* 613c (imitated by Macr. *Sat.* 7.1.6).

[89] On the *Lex Tappula* (*ILS* 8761) see von Premerstein 1904 and Konrad 1982, who both provide a text.

[90] On Domitius Apollinaris and his ties with Vercellae see Syme 1991c: 588–602 (cf. above, p. 159). He was a recipient of the Saturnalian books 4 (4.86), 7 (7.26), and 11 (11.15).

not limit himself to sympotic laws (17–18), but also includes laws on gift-giving (14–16) and on the conduct of the festival in general (13). At the end, he demands that his laws are inscribed on a bronze stele and put up in the house (18), just as had been done with the *Lex Tappula*. Both texts take the parody of the political institution of law-giving further than is done by ordinary, non-Saturnalian convivial laws, and this again shows that the Saturnalia were not merely an extended symposium (or the symposium "a miniature or more circumscribed "Saturnalia""[91]): not only did they share certain features with the symposium, they also radicalised those features. Therefore it will be useful, in returning to the modes of reception and the functions of Martial's epigrams, to discuss the symposium first, and then the Saturnalia.

It has been suggested above that the symposium, being a festive situation, set apart from the seriousness of everyday life, allowed for a relaxation of the constraints of the social hierarchy. Indeed, ancient authors regularly stress that what counts at the symposium is the humanity shared by all, not distinctions of rank or status[92]. Because Roman symposia (unlike Greek ones) did indeed bring together persons of different rank and status, and more particularly patrons and their clients, tension between convivial ideology and hierarchical praxis was inevitable[93]. The problematic balance between the two appears from a letter of Pliny (*Ep.* 2.6), in which he asserts that he serves the same food and wine to all his guests, even to the freedmen (4); however, the reason for Pliny's statement is that he had been present at a dinner where the host had served three different qualities of food and wine, corresponding to a tripartition among the participants: first the host himself and his guests of equal status, then the "lesser friends" (*minores amici*), i.e. the clients, and finally the freedmen (2–3). The "lesser friends" are the focus in Juvenal's fifth satire, the most scathing denunciation of the practice of differential treatment at dinner, which draws its inspiration not only from life (as

---

[91] The latter formulation is to be found in Barton 1993: 109.

[92] Cf. e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 9.24.3, Plin. *Ep.* 2.6.3–4, Plu. *Quaest. Conv.* ch. 1.2, esp. 616d–f.

[93] See D'Arms 1990 (partly repeating, partly developing D'Arms 1984: 338–48).

attested by Pliny), but also from a number of epigrams of Martial[94]. These epigrams concern the unequal distribution of food as well as wine, and are written from the perspective of the maltreated client, either speaking in his own person ("I") or representing a collective ("we"), and occasionally calling down a curse on the head of the host[95]. The first of these epigrams occurs already early in the first book and may serve to give an impression of the type:

Dic mihi, quis furor est? Turba spectante uocata
  solus boletos, Caeciliane, uoras.
Quid dignum tanto tibi uentre gulaque precabor?
  Boletum qualem Claudius edit, edas. (1.20)

Tell me, what madness is this? The crowd of your guests looks on, and you on your own, Caecilianus, devour mushrooms. What curse shall I call down on you to match such greed and gluttony? I pray that you may eat such a mushroom as Claudius ate.

The reference at the end is to the widely diffused story that the emperor Claudius was murdered by a poisoned mushroom[96], so that the speaker bluntly wishes for "Caecilianus'" death. The context of utterance of this epigram is obviously fictional, yet it may be asked whether this kind of fiction could have been presented at the symposium itself.

At first sight, this seems unlikely, because it might be thought that such attacks, even if fictional, would spoil the fun of the occasion. But one of the favourite topics of conversation at the symposium was the symposium itself, and there was no objection to criticism, not even to criticism of the host, if that remained within the bounds of propriety[97]. Martial's attacks far exceed these bounds, but

[94] Juvenal may in his turn have influenced the descriptions of unequal meals at Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 26 and *Ep. Sat.* 22 and 32 (although this is not certain: see Courtney 1980: 624–29, C.P. Jones 1986: 80–81).

[95] See 1.20, 1.43, 3.49, 3.60, 3.82, 4.68, 4.85, 6.11, 9.2, 10.49; 2.43, sometimes adduced in this context, does not concern treatment at the symposium. Cf. also 12.27 (28), where "I" is the host drinking better wine than his guest (who, however, drinks too much).

[96] See Howell 1980: 153–54.

[97] This appears most fully from Plutarch's *Quaestiones convivales*; criticism of the host is found e.g. in ch. 1.2 (615c–619a), of other hosts e.g. at ch. 5.5 (678c–679e).

then they are directed at fictional addressees; if we assume they were indeed delivered at the symposium, the real host would not have been offended, because the difference between himself and the fictional butt would be obvious to all. Indirectly, he would even be flattered, because the delivery of the epigram at his board would imply that he, in contrast, did behave according to the sympotic spirit of egalitarian treatment and friendly communication.

It may be that this is the framework within which we have to answer the question why Martial, in his epigrams to real patrons, so often mocks or teases them (but always in a gentle manner, never with the aggressiveness or contempt with which he treats his fictional addressees): if he performed at a symposium, his liberty of speech would be in accordance with the sympotic spirit, and the patron, by his tolerance, would show himself to be possessed of the broad-minded humanity so strongly advocated by such authors as Plutarch and Pliny. One may also compare what Lucian has Cronus tell the rich about the company of clients at dinner:

> οἳ πρῶτα μὲν οὐ κωφὸν καὶ ἄφωνον τὸ συμπόσιον ἐάσουσιν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐν μύθοις συμποτικοῖς καὶ σκώμμασιν ἀνεπαχθέσι καὶ φιλοφροσύναις ποικίλαις συνέσονται ... ἔπειτα δὲ πρὸς ἅπαντας ἐς τὴν ὑστεραίαν διηγούμενοι ὑμῶν τὴν δεξιότητα φιλεῖσθαι παρασκευάσουσι. (*Ep. Sat.* 34)
>
> in the first place they will not allow the symposium to be dumb and without conversation, but will dine with you among convivial stories, mockery without offence, and all kinds of friendly words ... and further they will tell everybody next day about your kindness, and so make you popular.

Martial did not need to go about in person, talking of yesterday's symposium, but he could reach a wider audience by publishing the poems he had addressed to the host. The reception of these poems would be particularly favourable if it again occurred at a symposium: the listeners, upon hearing a playful address to a patron, would greatly appreciate that that patron, in spite of his high position in the world, was not someone to spurn or spoil the joys in which they themselves were engaged at that very moment.

Lucian refers to "mockery without offence" (σκώμματα ἀνεπαχθῆ), and by that expression draws attention to the fact that the joking appreciated at symposia consisted in "mockery", which, if not carefully guarded, would *not* remain "without offence". This has

to be connected with the ancient idea of humour, according to which the primary objects of laughter were moral failings and bodily defects, and joking was a more harmless variety of criticism[98]. Various sources show what was expected in this respect from the guests at a symposium. Juvenal characterises a popular dinner guest as "entertaining with biting jokes" (*ioco mordente facetus*: 9.10), Lucian makes it clear that being convivial (συμποτικός) includes the ability to raise a laugh (*Merc. Cond.* 30), and Plutarch, in the first chapter of his *Convivial Questions* (1.1) mentions σκώπτειν and σκώπτεσθαι, "mocking and being mocked" as typical of the goings on at symposia, and even devotes the major part of another chapter (2.1) to suitable and unsuitable kinds of σκώμματα, "mocking jests"[99]. The presuppositions of these authors are shared by a fictional addressee of Martial:

> Festiue credis te, Calliodore, iocari
> et solum multo permaduisse sale.
> Omnibus arrides[100], dicteria dicis in omnis;
> sic te conuiuam posse placere putas.

---

[98] Cf. e.g. Cic. *De or.* 2.236–39, Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.8 (quoting Cicero) and 37. These ideas are already Aristotelian: see e.g. *EN* ch. 4.8 (esp. 1128a30 τὸ ... σκῶμμα λοιδόρημά τι ἐστίν) and *Po.* 1448a34–35 (with *Tractatus Coislinianus* 5 [8 Janko]: ὁ σκώπτων ἐλέγχειν θέλει ἁμαρτήματα τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος); cf. also Theophrastus' definition of σκῶμμα quoted by Plutarch in ch. 2.1 of the *Quaestiones convivales* (see below): ὀνειδισμὸς τῆς ἁμαρτίας παρεσχηματισμένος (631e).

[99] *Quaest. conv.* 613f–614a and 631c–634f, respectively. Although Plutarch's examples in ch. 2.1 do not all have sympotic settings, it is clear that he is primarily concerned with mockery at the symposium itself: see esp. 631c, 634a–f. Prescriptions like Plutatch's had of course long been current; cf. e.g. an epigram on a papyrus from the third century B.C.E. (P. Berol. 13270), with instructions to σκώπτειν τοιαῦθ' οἷα γέλωτα φέρειν (10) (often edited, e.g. as *anon.* 135 *FGE*).

[100] Shackleton Bailey changes the text to read *omnis irrides* (cf. 1978: 279), but this is rightly rejected by Grewing 1997: 314 (also by Saggese 1994: 54, n. 8, and Obermayer 1998: 218, n. 17), because the combination of flattery and mockery must be intended; one might compare the flattering *derisor* at Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.10–14 and *Ars* 433. *Adridere* is often used for laughing at someone when he laughs himself or makes a humorous remark; cf. e.g. Pl. *Capt.* 486 (a parasite's *dicta*), Cic. *De or.* 2.262 (and often elsewhere), Hor. *Ars* 101, Ov. *Ars* 2.201, *Met.* 3.459, Sen. *Ira* 2 (*Dial.* 4).2.4, 3 (*Dial.* 5).15.3 (at the *regia mensa*), *Cl.* 1.10.3 (Augustus *probrosis in se dictis adrisit*), Apul. *Met.* 3.19.1.

At si ego non belle, sed uero dixero quiddam,
nemo propinabit, Calliodore, tibi. (6.44)

You believe, Calliodorus, that you make entertaining jokes and that you alone are full of humour. You laugh at everybody's remarks, you say witty things against everybody: in this way you think you can be a welcome guest. (5) But if *I* say something not charming, but true, then nobody, Callidorus, will take your cup.

Martial threatens to answer "Calliodorus"' witticisms with a remark of his own, but by specifying what the consequences would be, he already makes that remark: "Calliodorus" has an unclean mouth (with the suggestion of oral sex). So although Martial doubtlessly considers himself wittier than "Calliodorus", his behaviour, in telling jokes at the expense of others, is not fundamentally different. We have seen that Martial himself refers to his work as *ioci*, and it is indeed possible to consider his epigrams, at least the large majority of them which can be called "skoptic", as poetic versions of the humorous *dicta*, "witty remarks", analysed by Cicero and Quintilian in their respective treatments of laughter[101]. Moreover, Martial himself was a frequent dinner guest, as he boasts elsewhere (9.97.10), and the suspicion can hardly be avoided that he owed his popularity precisely to his *dicta*. If that is so, the epigram against "Calliodorus" springs from a problem of demarcation.

The provision of humour at symposia was not only a contribution expected of the guests, it was also a task incumbent on various types of specialists, with whom Martial could even less afford to be identified[102]. Three such types are mentioned by Pliny, namely *scurrae cinaedi moriones*, who all make laughable remarks, the *morio* saying what is clownish (*stultum*), the *cinaedus* what is lewd (*molle*), the *scurra* what is impertinent (*petulans*) (*Ep.* 9.17.1–2). Martial, in so

[101] Cic. *De Orat.* 2.244–89, Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.27–35, 45–102. Barwick 1959: 42–48 (and, largely following him, Laurens 1989: 342–49) showed that many of the *pointes* of Martial's skoptic epigrams correspond to the *dicta* distinguished by Cicero and Quintilian, but the connection was already made in the theories of the epigram of Lessing and his predecessors, such as J. C. Scaliger and Boileau: see Barner 1985: 362–63.

[102] In the many ancient texts which describe a symposium, the jester is a recurring figure, usually a more or less professional γελωτοποιός (cf. Maas 1912), sometimes an "ordinary" guest playing that role: see J. Martin 1931: 51–64.

far as he (or his work) is a symposiastic entertainer, might be seen to come uncommonly close to these specialists, not of course to the *moriones*, who were "natural" fools[103], nor to the *cinaedi*, who were catamites, but to the *scurrae*. What *these* were is somewhat less easy to say, because the meaning of the word was not very strictly circumscribed, but a rough indication will suffice[104].

A *scurra*, at least from the Late Republic onwards, was basically a particular type of hanger-on, one who earned his dinner by entertaining the guests with his mockery[105]. The most vivid pictures are drawn by Horace. An example is his description of a contest of raillery between Sarmentus, a *scurra* from the entourage of Maecenas and Augustus, and another entertainer, which successfully amused the dinner-guests of the aristocratic Cocceius, including Maecenas, Virgil and Horace himself (*S.* 1.5.50–70). Another *scurra* whom Horace mentions by name is Maenius, who after squandering both his paternal and his maternal heritage, specialised in devising insults against each and everybody, so that some hosts fed him in order that he might speak, others in order that he might keep silent (*Ep.* 1.15.26–41). Already from these two examples it appears that the humour of the *scurrae* was not distinguished by great delicacy, and this impression is confirmed by the theories of laughter of Cicero and Quintilian, who both reject *scurrilitas* as being immoderate, untimely and indiscriminate; Quintilian makes the significant addition that the humour of the *scurra* often turns against himself[106]. This points to the double role of the *scurra*: he not only mocked, but was also mocked at, as we already saw in the case of Sarmentus; Juvenal, when referring to Sarmentus, even restricts himself to the latter aspect:

---

[103] It was considered fraudulence if a *morio* was an "artificial" fool; see Mart. 14.210, 8.13.

[104] The recent monograph on the *scurra* by Corbett 1986 is unsatisfactory, and recourse should still be had to Ribbeck 1888: 55–66. See also Saggese 1994 and Damon 1997, esp. 109–12.

[105] Another aspect of his behaviour could be flattery (cf. esp. Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.1–14); this too makes Martial come close to a *scurra*.

[106] Cicero: *De or.* 2.239, 244–47; cf. also *Orat.* 88. Quintilian: *Inst.* 6.3.29, 82 (in this last passage on *in se dicere*); cf. also 11.1.29. Ironically, Quintilian criticises Cicero himself for *scurrilitas* (6.3.48), as Cicero's contemporaries had already done (see Macr. *Sat.* 2.1.12).

si potes illa pati quae nec Sarmentus iniquas
Caesaris ad mensas nec uilis Gabba tulisset (Juv. 5.3–4)

if you can bear with such treatment as not even Sarmentus or the inferior Gabba would have suffered at the unequal dinners of Augustus

The Gabba mentioned alongside Sarmentus had been a famous jester, who is mentioned by Martial as a byword for *urbanitas* (10.101; cf. 1.41.16), but is called *uilis* here, because the price of his freedom to mock was that he lost his honour, so that others had equal freedom to mock *him*[107].

In spite of his admiration for Gabba, Martial himself had to avoid being "inferior". He achieved this not only by employing poetry (with the cultural prestige attached to it), but more importantly by employing fiction. The mockery of the *scurrae* was usually directed at those present at the symposium, as we have seen in the case of Sarmentus, but they could also direct their barbs at people who were absent, as Horace testifies of the venomous Maenius (*S.* 1.3.21)[108]. Martial offered fictional versions of both varieties: usually he employed a fictional addressee, who was joked at as if he were present, but sometimes the fictional butt was a third party, supposed to exist outside the context of utterance[109]. Of course, Martial also joked with real addressees and about real third parties: but then his humour was never *scurrilis*, but consisted in the kind of friendly banter which was the hallmark of the sympotic spirit. Thus, with his gentle mockery of real persons Martial behaved as the gentleman guest he was, while with his savage mockery of fictional persons he played the role of the *scurra*, yet without compromising his own status, and without endangering the seriousness of his praise, whenever he offered praise. The compatibility of the two modes, the satirical and the panegyrical, needs to be still further clarified, but that can best be

107 Another good example of a *scurra* who was scoffer and butt at the same time is Vatinius (who was bodily deformed, as this kind of jester often was): see Sen. *Const. sap.* (*Dial.* 2).17.3, Tac. *Ann.* 15.34.2.

108 Criticism of those present at the symposium is also found e.g. at Hor. *S.* 1.4.86–90 (clearly *scurrae*, even if the word is not mentioned), Luc. *Symp.* 18 (a γελωτοποιός, who ἐπέσκωπτεν ἐς τοὺς παρόντας), *Merc. Cond.* 34 (a κίναιδος, εἰς τοὺς ... παρόντας ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ ἀποσκώπτων). Criticism of absent people also at Sen. *Ep.* 122.12–13.

109 For fuller discussion of Martial's use of fictional persons see pp. 42–45 and 48.

done by extending the discussion to the relationship between Martial's poetry and the Saturnalia.

That theme belongs to a complex of questions associated with the name of the Russian theoretician Mikhail Bakhtin, who even specifically referred to Martial, if only in passing: "all of Martial's work", he remarked, "was directly connected with the saturnalia"[110]. We have seen that at least some (if probably not "all") of Martial's work was published at the Saturnalia, and Bakhtin seems to assume this was the case, but his primary concern is not with the reception situation, but with the character of Martial's work. His context is what he calls "carnivalised literature", i.e. "literature that was influenced—directly and without mediation, or indirectly, through a series of intermediate links—by one or another variant of carnivalistic folklore"[111]. He has no doubt that "the essence of carnival ... was most clearly expressed and experienced in the Roman Saturnalias [*sic*]" and that "the tradition of the Saturnalias [*sic*] remained unbroken and alive in the medieval carnival"[112]. Of these two hypotheses, the latter, postulating a continuous development from the Roman Saturnalia to the medieval carnival, has now been generally abandoned, but the first can be upheld, if its hyperbolic language is reduced to the statement that the Saturnalia was a festival of the carnivalistic type: like carnival, it was a strictly delimited period of time, during which the normal order was (partly) replaced by an alternative, "licensed" order, which provided abundant occasion for festive laughter[113]. Bakhtin

---

[110] Bakhtin 1984a: 129. This book was first published in Russian in 1929, but the section which is relevant for our theme (106–27) was only added in the second Russian edition of 1963 (see Clark and Holquist 1984: 239–40).

[111] Bakhtin 1984a: 107; cf. 122, 129–37.

[112] Bakhtin 1984b: 7–8. This book was published in Russian in 1965, although it was mainly written in the 1930s and a first version of the manuscript had been finished by 1940 (see Clark and Holquist 1984: 263, 321–25, 335). The continuity of the Saturnalia and carnival is also stated at 1984a: 129, in the same context as the pronouncement on Martial.

[113] Moser 1990 rightly criticises Bakhtin's belief in the continuity of Saturnalia and carnival, but goes too far, I think, in denying the usefulness of a typological (as distinguished from a strictly historical) concept of "carnival". He also denies the importance of laughter for the carnival, which seems to be correct for the time up to about 1500, but not for the sixteenth century and afterwards: see Mezger 1993: 256–

himself declares that he uses the word "carnival" as a synecdoche for "the sum total of all diverse rituals and forms of a carnival type"[114], but he does not always avoid the pitfall of transferring features specific to one type (i.e. the late mediaeval carnival or the Roman carnival of 1788 as described in Goethe's *Italienische Reise*) to another type (e.g. the ancient Roman Saturnalia). So the best way to proceed will be, first, to ascertain in how far Martial's work can be considered "carnivalised literature" in Bakhtin's sense, and then, to ask in how far a connection can be established not with Bakhtin's generalised picture of "carnival", but with what we know about the Saturnalia, in order to see whether the circumstance that (some of) Martial's epigrams were read at the Saturnalia significantly adds to the social functions they performed.

Bakhtin illustrates his views on the carnivalisation of literature in Antiquity not from poetry, but, in accordance with the main thrust of his theoretical interest, from two genres of narrative prose: the Socratic dialogue and the Menippean satire, both of which he sees as manifestations of the realm of the σπουδογέλοιον or "serio-comical"[115]. The "serio-comical", according to Bakhtin, "constitutes the first example" of "carnivalised literature", and is characterised by a focus on the "living present", a rejection of "legend", and a "deliberate multi-styled and hetero-voiced nature"[116]. It has been rightly objected to Bakhtin that σπουδογέλοιον is not, as he thinks, an ancient literary category, and, more importantly, that the characterisation he gives of it fits the "comical" just as well or even better than the "serio-comical"— which is all the more relevant because the Greek Old Comedy has a demonstrable connection with festivals of the carnivalistic type, whereas this cannot be demonstrated for the

58. In the course of time the carnival (as a historical phenomenon) seems to have become more "carnivalistic" (in the typological sense). Cf. also Rösler 1993: 86–91.

[114] Bakhtin 1984a: 122.

[115] Bakhtin's source of information on these genres is Hirzel 1895; cf. e.g. Bakhtin 1984a: 106–07 with Hirzel 2.2–7 and 2.446, Bakhtin 116 with Hirzel 2.34, n.1, and Bakhtin 120 with Hirzel 1.38, n.1 and 1.446.

[116] Bakhtin 1984a: 106–22; the quotations are from 107 and from 108, where "the three basic characteristics common to all genres that enter the realm of the serio-comical" [108–09] are given).

Socratic dialogue or the Menippean satire[117]. However, two Menippean satires which Bakhtin often has in mind, Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and Julian's *Caesares*, were indeed composed for the Saturnalia (as Bakhtin knew), so that for these two works one could speak of "direct carnivalisation"[118]. But then the term should not be conceived in terms of an "influence" of the festival on the genre, but rather in terms of a certain structural and functional homology which made the festival susceptible to being the reception situation (or setting or theme) of works in the genre[119]. Our question will then be if such a homology can also be recognised in the case the epigrams of Martial.

Bakhtin's three characteristics of the serio-comical certainly do apply to Martial. His epigrams are exclusively concerned with the "living present", whether they are written in the satirical or in the panegyrical mode; both modes contribute to the knowledge of "life" (*uita*), "manners" (*mores*) and, in short, "man" (*homo*) which Martial claims to offer to his readers[120]. This realistic programme is accompanied by the rejection of "legend", i.e. of the mythological themes characteristic of the "high" genres of epic and tragedy[121]. Thirdly, Martial's epigrams are "multi-styled and hetero-voiced": we find the solemn juxtaposed with the obscene not only *between* epigrams, but also *within* epigrams; more generally, poetic language is continually

---

[117] See Rösler 1986, and extensively on Old Comedy von Möllendorff 1995.

[118] Cf. Nauta 1987, where at 94, n. 79 the reference to Bakhtin (quoted from the French translation) should read "154, n. 1; cf. 200, n. 1".

[119] But in so far as Menippean satire is dependent on Old Comedy, and in so far as Old Comedy has a direct connection with carnival (in the broad, typological sense), one could speak of "indirect" carnivalisation, as meant in the definition quoted above and further described at Bakhtin 1984a: 131.

[120] See esp. 8.3.19–20, 10.4.9–12.

[121] See 14.1 (on the Saturnalian poetry of the *Apophoreta*), 4.49, 5.53, 8.3, 9.50, 10.4, a group of poems well discussed by Citroni 1968: 273–80. It is to be noted that Martial calls the unnatural meals and monstrous creatures of mythology *lusus* and *ioci* (4.49.2) and *ludibria* (10.4.7), which reminds one of Bakhtin's concept of the "grotesque body" (e.g. Bakhtin 1984b: 18–30, 303–67). But Martial *rejects* these motifs, in favour of his own, less grotesque, *ioci*.

being combined with prosaic elements, including proverbs, colloquialisms and Greek expressions quoted in the original[122].

Another feature which is relevant in this respect is the use of dialogue: almost all his epigrams have an addressee, and even when he makes a joke about a third party, he usually addresses this joke to one of his friends or patrons[123]. "Dialogue" is a central concept in Bakhtin, linked to his theory of truth: truth can never be fixed within a single discourse, but is always being negotiated and re-negotiated in the interaction of a plurality of discourses. But in any given society, there normally is an official discourse, which claims to hold the monopoly of truth; dialogue necessarily challenges such "official monologism", and has therefore an oppositional and liberating character[124]. It shares this character with another key concept in Bakhtin, laughter, especially carnival laughter, which he sees as breaking the tyranny of official truth, as a "free weapon" in the hands of the people[125]. This view is not merely a historical reconstruction, but at the same time, even if more covertly, the projection of a political vision for Bakhtin's own time, when the official truth, harshly "monologic", was Stalinism[126]. In how far Bakhtin's ideological concerns have impaired (or perhaps even enhanced) the value of his descriptions of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance can be contested, but neither his picture of "carnival laughter" nor his concept of "dialogue" fits the epigrams of Martial.

As we have already seen, Martial never directs his laughter against the emperor or (harmless banter apart) against any member of the Roman elite; his victims are always fictional. This also means that they cannot talk back, as real victims can and will: at the symposium the ability of improvising fitting ripostes was highly prized, and

---

[122] See Sullivan 1991: 230 with references to the specialised literature (add Weinreich 1928: 161–65 on Martial's use of Greek).

[123] Newman 1990, in an idiosyncratic Bakhtinian reading of Catullus, treats "dialogic form" alongside "carnival words" (277–317), but does not elaborate on either theme in the chapter he devotes to Martial (75–103).

[124] Bakhtin's views on dialogue occur *passim* in his oeuvre; I here paraphrase (and quote from) 1984a: 110.

[125] Carnival laughter is briefly characterised at Bakhtin 1984a: 126–27 and 1984b: 11–12, more extensively at 1984b: 59–144, esp. 86–94; the quotation is from 94.

[126] See Clark and Holquist 1984: 305–20.

sometimes veritable contests of mockery occurred[127]. But in Martial a dialogue between opposing viewpoints does not take place: he has always the last word, and with that, the last laugh. Nevertheless, in his fictional pseudo-dialogues his victim sometimes does stand higher in the social hierarchy than he himself, e.g. in those epigrams in which he ridicules a stingy or cruel patron. However, what is attacked in such epigrams is not the social hierarchy as such, but its imperfect realisation in practice. Criticism of the behaviour of a patron does not question the institution of patronage, but, on the contrary, takes that institution as a given, and presupposes that patrons and clients each have their proper role to play. If they fail to do so, Martial will criticise the patrons, but the clients just as well[128].

This kind of comment on the relations between the rich and the poor would fit well on the Saturnalia, because the festival, too, was concerned with these relations (even if to a lesser degree than with the relations between masters and slaves, which are the focus of the majority of the surviving testimonies). The most instructive text in this respect is Lucian's *Ta pros Kronon*, which does not discuss the Greek Kronia, but the Roman Saturnalia, so that "Kronos" can be taken as merely the Greek name for Saturn[129]. The text consists of three parts, a conversation between a priest (in whom we may recognise Lucian) and Saturn, a set of laws for the festival, and a correspondence between Lucian, Saturn, and the rich; the standard Latin titles are *Saturnalia* for the first two parts taken together, and *Epistulae Saturnales* for the third part. All three parts follow the same, highly significant, line of thought. In the first part, the priest starts out by asking Saturn for wealth (*Sat.* 1), but the latter refuses, because the distribution of wealth is the responsibility of Jupiter, whereas his own jurisdiction is limited to the customs of the Saturnalia (2). The priest retorts that Jupiter's regime is unjust (3), but then goes on to question Saturnus about his festival and the concomitant myths (4–9). In the introduction to the second part, the

[127] Plutarch calls these ripostes ἄμυναι (*Quaest. conv.* 622a); note that Quintilian in his theory of humour makes a distinction between *prouocare* (or *lacessere*) and *respondere* (*Inst.* 6.3.13, 45–46, 84; cf. Cic. *De or.* 2.230). The best known contest of mockery is that between Sarmentus and Messius at Hor. *S.* 1.5.51–70.

[128] See in this sense Sullivan 1991: 159–62.

[129] See Helm 1906: 215–26, C.P. Jones 1986: 87–88.

priest, who is now called Cronosolon as being the giver of Saturn's laws (10), again complains of his undeserved poverty, but Saturn's answer is the same: he is not accountable (11). However, he proposes to issue laws for the festival (11–12), and these prescribe that equal treatment (ἰσοτιμία) should be given to slaves and free men, to poor and rich (13). Special laws are devoted to the presents the rich have to give to the poor (14–16) and to the way they have to treat the poor at the symposium (17–18). In the third part these motifs are then further developed. Again Lucian reproaches Saturn for not abolishing inequality (τὸ ἄνισον) (*Ep. Sat.* 19) and for allowing the rich to maltreat the poor, especially at the symposium (20–24). But again Saturn responds that abolishing inequality and bringing about a redistribution (ἀναδασμός) of wealth belong to the cognisance of Jupiter (25); and he adds that the life of the rich is by no means as pleasant as Lucian imagines, and that the poor are unwise to aspire to it (26–30). But if equal treatment cannot be introduced into everyday life, it does have a place at the Saturnalia, and accordingly Saturn writes to the rich to urge them to give generous gifts to the poor, promising them that if they do this, the poor will not bring a summons for redistribution before the court of Jupiter (31). Apart from gifts, Saturn again pays special attention to equal treatment at the symposium (32), explaining how easily this will turn envy into admiration (33–35). In their answer, the rich first affirm that Jupiter has indeed good reasons not to bring about a redistribution and make an end of inequality (36), but then they declare that they are prepared to obey Saturn's instructions, provided the poor do not abuse the equality granted to them at the symposium and do not demand more than is their due (36–39).

All three parts begin with a demand for greater equality formulated by the poor, and continue with the answer given by Saturn, who always argues that equality cannot be realised outside his festival, which is only a temporary suspension of the incontrovertible realities of everyday life. In all three parts Lucian identifies himself with the poor, but we may safely say that in all three parts he stages his own refutation by Saturn, who as the god of the festival has the maximum possible authority. Clearly, in Lucian's as in Saturn's view, the function of the Saturnalia is not to undermine the existing order, but on the contrary to strengthen it by granting temporary indulgence to the underprivileged, so that these will be reconciled to their position

and not attempt to revolt against their betters. This analysis is somewhat crude, but it is fundamentally the same as the one proposed in greater detail and with more conceptual sophistication by modern anthropologists and ancient historians[130].

The reconciliatory and consolidating character of the Saturnalia also appears from the importance Lucian attributes to gift-giving, a recurring topic in the correspondence between himself, Saturn, and the rich, but also the subject of a series of laws. These laws, like the others on the general conduct of the festival and on the symposium, are given only to the rich, because Lucian claims to have given laws to the poor in another book (which has not survived, if it ever existed) (*Sat.* 10). It appears that at the Saturnalia there was not just gift-exchange, which as such serves to strengthen the relationship between the participants, but *asymmetrical* gift-exchange, which in addition serves to define the asymmetry of that relationship[131].

The existence of differential norms in the matter of gift-giving is confirmed by Martial, who before he started publishing his books with mixed epigrams, published two books with descriptions of Saturnalian gifts, the *Xenia* (counted as Book 13 in modern editions) and the *Apophoreta* (Book 14). Both were published during the Saturnalia itself, and belonged to the category of Saturnalian literature designed to provide amusing reading material for the festival[132]. In the *Xenia* Martial sometimes differentiates between gifts from the rich and the poor[133], and in the *Apophoreta* this distinction has even become the organising principle of the book[134]. Lucian, on the other hand, concentrates on only one side of the exchange, instructing the rich to give presents of cash, clothing, furniture, and silver to the poor (*Sat.* 15–16). However, he also tells the poor how to respond:

---

130 See esp. Versnel 1993: 115–21; cf. 159. For criticism (which I have now come to share) of this theory see Scott 1990: 172–82.

131 See Baudy 1987 (on the *Kalendae Ianuariae*, but with relevance to the Saturnalia). Gift-exchange and its functions is further discussed at pp. 78–87.

132 On the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* as Saturnalian literature see Citroni 1992: 431–39 (slightly revised from Citroni 1989: 205–12).

133 E.g. 13.6, 27, 45, 76, 103, 106.

134 Cf. 14.1.5: *diuitis alternas et pauperis accipe sortes*. The alternation has been partly disturbed in the transmission; for different reconstructions see Birt 1882: 71–87 (cf. 1913: 351–56), L. Friedländer 1886: 2.295–300, and Leary 1996: 13–21.

by sending garlands or incense, but if they are well-educated by sending a more appropriate gift:

> Ἀντιπεμπέτω δὲ ὁ πένης τῷ πλουσίῳ ὁ ... πεπαιδευμένος βιβλίον τῶν παλαιῶν, εἴ τι εὔφημον καὶ συμποτικόν, ἢ αὐτοῦ σύγγραμμα ὁποῖον ἂν δύνηται (*Sat.* 16)
>
> In exchange the poor man, if he is an intellectual, will send to the rich man a book by a classic author, provided it is genial and convivial, or a work by himself, as his abilities allow.

It appears from Martial's descriptions of Saturnalian gifts in the *Apophoreta* that books were indeed a common gift at the Saturnalia, although his selection is not limited to works one might call "genial and convivial", but also includes editions of such serious authors as Sallust and Lucan (14.183–96). But even though Lucian's requirement of geniality and conviviality is not explicitly extended to the own production of the poor intellectual, Martial's own Saturnalian books are of course convivial, and genial at least in so far as their attitude to patrons is concerned; in this respect they agree with the few transmitted texts by other authors which define themselves as gifts for the Saturnalia[135]. Martial sometimes comments on the Saturnalian character of the book he is sending in a dedicatory poem, and he always combines this with a gesture of reverence towards the addressee: his poems are the gift of a "poor man" (*pauper*) to the "rich man" (*diues*) Quintianus (5.18), mere *ioci*, not to be compared with the great epic of Silius Italicus (4.14) or the wide-ranging poetic production of Varro (5.30), but just good enough to beguile the leisure of Fuscus, the successful barrister (7.28) or of Macer, the curator of the Appian road (10.18 [17])[136]. In spite of the rituals of equality celebrated at the Saturnalia, the offering of a book as a Saturna-

---

[135] Catul. 14 (for Calvus), Leon. 2 *FGE* = *AP* 6.322 (for a Marcus; the gift is an ἄθυρμα [3], to be used ἐν δείπνοις καὶ παρὰ μουσοπόλοις [4]), Stat. *Silv.* 4.9 (for Plotius Grypus). In all these cases the gift consists in the poem itself, but note that Catullus announces that he will send books the next day (17–20) and that Statius had already sent a *libellus* (2); moreover, both Catullus' and Statius' poem are provoked by having received a *libellus* (Catul. 14.12, Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.1) which they protest was not εὔφημον.

[136] The only exception is 11.15, to Apollinaris, where asymmetry is not a theme.

lian gift by no means entailed any suspension of the existing social hierarchy[137].

We see that the convergence between Martial's work and the Saturnalia has two aspects: entertainment and the discussion of hierarchy. As for the first aspect, Lucian not only legislates that Saturnalian books sent as gifts should be "genial and convivial", but also that works which are recited during the Saturnalia should exhibit σκῶμμα καὶ παιδιάν, "mockery and play" (*Sat.* 13). To meet the need for such texts, a wide and variegated tradition of "literature for the Saturnalia" had arisen, to which Martial had already contributed with his *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, and into which he could also insert his books with mixed epigrams, which were full enough of mockery and play[138]. They also contained serious panegyric epigrams, but the persons praised in them would not object to the entertaining context (both textually and extra-textually), because it guaranteed a wide and benevolent reception.

Moreover—and this is the second aspect—the Saturnalia were characterised by playing out the relationship between the rich and the poor, in so far as these were bound together by gift-exchange and by sympotic hospitality (the two themes of Lucian's treatment), in other words in so far as they were "friends" (φίλοι)[139]. But this is to say that the relationship that was being played out was characterised not only by asymmetry and exchange, but also by duration, in other words that it was *patronage*. And this again made the Saturnalia into an extraordinarily fitting context for Martial's poetry on and for pa-

---

137 Similarly in Stat. *Silv.* 4.9, which by its hierarchical attitude distinguishes itself from its model, Catul. 14, which was written from equal to equal; cf. Damon 1992.

138 Apart from entertaining poems written as gifts (see above, n. 135), Roman literature for the Saturnalia comprised such diverse types of texts as (i.a.) mock-didactic works on playful and festive activities (see Ov. *Tr.* 2. 471–92), collections of riddles (such as *AL* 281 SB) to provide material for what was a favourite Saturnalian pastime (cf. Gel. 18.2, 18.13), and even, under certain circumstances, political satire (such as Sen. *Apoc.* and Jul. *Caes.*). More evidence on literature for the Saturnalia is collected in von Premerstein 1904: 342–47, to be supplemented from Nauta 1987: 79–82, Citroni 1989: 201–06 and Citroni 1992: 425–33; the survey by Döpp 1993 (not only on literature meant for reception at the Saturnalia, but also on literature connected with the Saturnalia in any other way) omits some of the Latin and all of the Greek evidence.

139 See Luc. *Sat.* 14–15; note also *Ep. Sat.* 35 and 39.

trons. On the one hand he had the licence to criticise, even if this licence was strictly controlled, so that he had to confine his attacks to fictional persons. On the other hand criticisms of deviations from the norm strengthen the norm itself, so that Martial's carnivalistic mockery of fictional patrons adds point and credibility to his serious panegyric of real patrons[140].

[140] I would now stress (cf. n. 130) that the reverse might also be true: criticsm of fictional patrons might undermine the praise of real patrons. I hope to return to this in a future publication.

PART TWO

NON-IMPERIAL PATRONAGE AND STATIUS' *SILVAE*

CHAPTER FOUR

PATRONAGE IN STATIUS' *SILVAE*

Statius' *Silvae* consist of five books, of which the first four were put together, and fitted out with an epistolary preface, by the poet himself. The fifth book, however, was published posthumously, and to this circumstance we owe the preservation of a unique document. The unknown editor, faced with the absence of a preface, decided to substitute the covering letter of the poem he put first[1]. The letter is addressed to the imperial freedman Abascantus, the *ab epistulis* (i.e. head of the chancellery), and introduces a poem of mourning on his late wife, Priscilla. Statius explains why he has written the poem:

> Ego ... huic operi non ut unus e turba nec tantum quasi officiosus adsilui. Amauit enim uxorem meam Priscilla et amando fecit mihi illam probatiorem; post hoc ingratus sum, si lacrimas tuas transeo. Praeterea latus omne diuinae domus semper demereri pro mea mediocritate conitor. Nam qui bona fide deos colit, amat et sacerdotes. Sed quamuis propiorem usum amicitiae tuae iampridem cuperem, mallem tamen nondum inuenisse materiam. (5.1.*ep*.5–12)

> I ... jumped to this task not like one from the crowd nor as if I only paid my respects. For Priscilla loved my wife, and by loving her made her more commendable to me; after this, I am ungrateful if I pas over your tears. Moreover, I always try (as far as my mediocrity permits) to be of service to each companion of the divine house. For whoever sincerely honours the gods, loves their priests as well. But although I had long wished for a more intimate experience of your friendship, yet I would have preferred not to have found an occasion so soon.

The passage is couched in the terminology of *amicitia*, *amare*, *officium* and *gratia*[2]. Statius begins by claiming that he has written his poem not merely as an *officiosus*, i.e. as someone who performs his duty in the exchange of mutual services (*officia*), but also because he feels bound to Abascantus through two indirect connections. First, Priscilla had entertained a relationship with Statius' wife which

---

[1] Cf. Laguna 1992: 11–12.

[2] Cf. Introduction, pp. 14–18, 24–25.

could be characterised as *amare* ("love"), and from which Statius himself had also benefited, so that he is now under the obligation of solving *gratia* ("gratefulness") to Priscilla's widower, Abascantus. Secondly, Statius' devotion to the emperor entails that he seeks a relationship with the emperor's servants which, like the relationship between his wife and Priscilla, can be characterised with the word *amare*, or alternatively with the related word *amicitia* ("friendship").

The use of the vocabulary of *amare* and *amicitia* shows that the relationship that Statius envisages is a personal one, although that should not be taken to imply that it is also a symmetrical one: there was a vast difference in power and wealth between Statius and one of the chief imperial ministers, even though the latter was a freedman. Further, the use of the vocabulary of *officium* and *gratia* shows that the relationship is founded on reciprocal exchange: Statius has written the poem because he considers that he owes something to Abascantus[3], but he also hopes that the poem will inaugurate a "more intimate experience of your *amicitia*", which seems to hint at increased services from Abascantus, probably in the nature of "brokerage" with the emperor, to whom Abascantus had personal access[4].

So the relationship between Statius and Abascantus, being personal (and therefore of some duration), asymmetrical, and reciprocal, meets the three criteria for "patronage" that have been specified in the Introduction. In the rest of this chapter it will be investigated whether the relationships between Statius and his other addressees also meet these criteria: asymmetry, duration, and reciprocity—to be discussed in that order. As a preliminary to all three points, it will be necessary to certify what can be known about the social position of Statius himself.

---

[3] For a *consolatio* as a contribution to exchange, entitling to poet to *gratia*, see 5.5.43–45.

[4] For the phrase *latus diuinae domus* cf. *sacrum... latus* (5.1.187); similarly in 3.3, on another imperial freedman, *Caesareum ... latus* (65). For "brokerage" with the emperor through his freedmen see pp. 341–349.

Preliminary: Statius' Background and Career

There are four poems in the *Silvae* which are not addressed to the emperor or a non-imperial patron, and are entirely devoted to Statius' own private life[5]. Three of these poems occur in the posthumously published fifth book: 5.3, a long lament on the death of his father, 5.4, a short address to Sleep, and 5.5, a lament on the death of a favourite slave boy; the fourth poem is 3.5, addressed to his wife Claudia, in which he urges her to agree to retirement to his native Naples (cf. 3.*ep.*20–23). The inclusion of this personal poem in the published *Silvae* is probably to be explained from its character as a σφραγίς ("seal"): it stands in final position in Book 3, and Statius probably intended it as the conclusion of his *Silvae*, not anticipating that he would remain in Rome, compose further pieces, and publish a further book[6].

Of these four poems, the most important is 5.3, but its interpretation is bedevilled by uncertainty about the chronology of its composition. On the one hand Statius declares that he is writing three months after his father's death, having composed nothing in the meantime (29–33). On the other hand he complains that his father has not lived to witness his victory in the poetry competition of the Alban Games and his defeat in the poetry competition of the Capitoline Games (225–33), both of which events must therefore have followed his father's death[7]. But this is inconsistent with his claim of poetic inactivity between his father's death and the composition of the poem. The inconsistency will become even more apparent if we consider the dates involved.

Statius' father died when contemplating a poem on the eruption of the Vesuvius (205–08), which occurred in August 79; the context

[5] Discussions of Statius' life (and of that of his father) include Frère 1961: I.ix–xxv, Aricò 1980: 15–26, Hardie 1983: 2–14, 58–72 (cf. the criticisms of van Dam 1988: 706–07), van Dam 1984: 1–3, Coleman 1988: xv–xx, Laguna 1992: 3–13. See also *PIR*[2] 103 (Statius' father) and 104 (Statius himself).

[6] See below, p. 204. Ancient poets often concluded a collection with a σφραγίς in which they talked of themselves and their *patria*: see Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 335 (and cf. p. 118, n. 91 on Martial).

[7] This is overlooked by Hardie 1983: 12–13, who puts these events before the father's death (misdating, as a consequence, both the death and the poem).

makes it clear that this poem would have been an immediate reaction (cf. 195–202), so that the death must have occurred at the end of 79. This conclusion is supported by a further consideration. In the poem to his wife, Statius calls her the "only witness" to the "long labour" of his epic the *Thebaid* (3.5.35–36), whereas in the lament on the death of his father he states that the work was begun under his father's guidance (5.3.233–37); so the latter's death must have occurred in the very first phases of the composition of the epic. Now the *Thebaid* was completed in 91–92[8], and on Statius' own account took him twelve years to write (*Theb.* 12.811–12); of course the number of years is too neatly identical with the number of books to be above suspicion, and the real gestation time may well have been a year more or less. These considerations put the composition of the *Thebaid* in the period from 78–81 to 91–92, and the death of Statius' father in the years around 80. So the original reasoning, dating the death to late 79, can be accepted (and as a corollary the beginning of the composition of the *Thebaid* can be more precisely assigned to 78–79).

The victory at the Alban Games, on the other hand, probably took place no less than ten years later. These games were held on Domitian's estate at Alba Longa, and took place in March of each year[9]. Statius won the prize with a poem in which he alternately sang Domitian's wars with the Germans and the Dacians (4.2.65–67), which almost certainly refers to Domitian's double triumph in autumn 89 over these two peoples[10]. So Statius' victory probably was from March 90. But this implies that the passage in 5.3 mentioning this victory (227–30) is a later insertion[11]. The question then becomes how far the insertion extends, and when and why it was made.

---

[8] The *terminus ante quem* is the end of 92, the date of Domitian's campaign against the Sarmatians, which is not mentioned in Statius' survey of the emperor's military achievements in the proem (*Theb.* 1.17–24; cf. Frère 1961: 1.xiv–xvi). The *terminus post quem* is given by *Silv.* 1.5.8–9 and 3.2.40–41, 142–43, where the *Thebaid* is mentioned as not yet completed; 3.2 cannot be independently dated, but 1.5 is contemporaneous with Mart. 6.42, which is from 90 or 91. The completion of the epic must be somewhat later, at the earliest in 91.

[9] Suet. *Dom.* 4.4, D.C. 67.1.2. See further p. 329.

[10] See p. 329.

[11] The alternative hypothesis, formulated by Vollmer 1898: 9–10, n. 10, 526, 543–44, and accepted by Frère 1961: 1.xxv, 2.192–94, n. 2, that Statius' indication

It must in any case cover the immediately following reference to Statius' defeat at the Capitoline Games (231–33). These games were held from 86 onwards, every four years, the poetry contest taking place in May[12]. Because Statius, here and at the other occasion where he speaks of his defeat (3.5.31–33), mentions it after the victory at the Alban Games, it probably did not occur in 86, but in 90 or 94[13]. Now the insertion probably did not end with the section on the defeat, because that ends in mid-verse (233); more probably it runs on to 238 and thus includes the section in which Statius declares that he sorely misses his father's advice on the composition of the *Thebaid* (233–38). As was said above, the *Thebaid* was completed in 91–92, which implies that Statius' defeat in the Capitoline Games cannot have occurred in 94, when the epic was already published, but must be dated to May 90, shortly after the victory in the Alban Games in March of that same year[14].

The insertion probably does not continue after 238, because in 239–45 Statius describes his mother's behaviour shortly after the funeral[15]. The new section is introduced by the words "I was not the only one whom you fostered with generous devotion" (239), so that the preceding section must have dealt with the devotion of Statius'

---

of the date of composition is a fiction, is less probable, because it would attribute the inconsistency to Statius' original design rather than to a later (and perhaps unfinished) reworking. If this hypothesis is correct, the entire poem should have to be dated to the date established for the insertion.

[12] The *Fasti Ostienses* for 146 (text in Vidman 1982: 50) show that the Games began *[-M]ai[a]s*, i.e. either *[k. M]ai[a]s* (May 1) or *[id. M]ai[a]s* (May 15), there being no space on the stone for longer restorations (see the drawing in Vidman, 33, and his Plate XVII). The inscription continues with mention of *circenses* and *[gy]mnicum*. Because the Capitoline *certamen* was *musicum equestre gymnicum* (Suet. *Dom.* 4.4), the *musicum* part apparently took place first, i.e. in May (perhaps lasting into the first days of June, because the *circenses* took place between June 7 and 10). The same date may be assumed for the time of Domitian, because it is unlikely that the schedule was changed. See Loriot 1974, esp. 302–04 (and, for another argument in favour of late spring, already Robert 1930: 30–31 = 1969: 1130–31). On the Capitoline Games in general see pp. 328–335.

[13] A later date does not come into account, because Statius did not survive Domitian, who was assassinated in 96; see below, p. 204.

[14] At 3.5.28–36, there is the same order: victory in the Alban Games, defeat in the Capitoline Games, composition of the *Thebaid*.

[15] It is hardly likely that *iam* in 242 covers a period of ten years.

father to Statius himself. This implies that 209–24, in which this theme is introduced, belonged to the original text, while the insertion covers lines 225–38. Indeed, in 220–24 we find a long mythological comparison, with apparent closural function, as so often in the *Silvae*[16]. The date of the insertion must be between the poetical contest at the Capitoline Games of May 90 and the completion of the *Thebaid* sometime in 90 or 91. Its purpose is less easy to determine. Perhaps Statius took up the poem with the intention of including it as a kind of self-presentation in the first book of his *Silvae* (which was published shortly after the publication of the *Thebaid*[17]), but later abandoned the idea.

The main part of the poem consists in a laudative description of the father's life and death, in chronological order, beginning with his origin and rank. Statius specifies that his father was born in Velia, an ancient Greek colony about 100 km south of Naples (126–28), and characterises his descent as follows:

> Non tibi deformes obscuri sanguinis ortus
> nec sine luce genus, quamquam fortuna parentum
> artior expensis. Etenim te diuite ritu
> sumere purpureos Infantia legit amictus
> stirpis honore datos et nobile pectoris aurum. (5.3.116–20)

> Your origins are not unseemly, of obscure blood, nor is your family without lustre, although your parents' fortune was not as ample as their expenses. Indeed with rich ceremony Childhood chose you to don the purple garments given to honourable descent and the noble breast-gold.

It is almost universally assumed that Statius here implies that his father's family lost its original equestrian rank through impoverishment[18], but in fact the text says nothing either about equestrian rank or about its loss. The "purple garments" (i.e. the *toga praetexta*) and the "noble breast-gold" (i.e. an amulet called the *bulla*) were signs of free birth, not of equestrian rank, and if Statius had wished to convey that his father's family was equestrian, he would probably have said

---

[16] See Cancik 1965: 28 (and *passim*).

[17] *Silv.* 1.*ep*.6–7. See further below, pp. 285–289.

[18] To limit myself only to the authors mentioned in n. 5: Frère 1961: 1.ix, Aricò 1980: 15, Hardie 1983: 6 with n. 35 (sceptical), Coleman 1988: xv ("perhaps"), Laguna 1992: 4 ("quizá"), *PIR*^{2} P 103. Van Dam 1984 does not discuss the matter.

so[19]. As the text stands, it is more likely that his grandparents belonged to the order of the *decuriones* (the local aristocracy) in Velia, and that the loss of their wealth had to do with the public benefactions (such as the construction of buildings or the giving of games), that were expected from the members of this class[20]. However this may have been, in any case Statius' father did not pursue a political career in Velia, but became a professional poet in Naples, the major centre of Greek culture in the West.

Being a Greek professional poet entailed participation in the circuit of poetry contests which encompassed the entire Greek world[21]. Statius reports that his father gained repeated victories, in prose as well as poetry, at the Augustalia in Naples itself (112–115, 134–40), but was also successful at the famous games in mainland Greece, the Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian (the Olympic Games did not include a poetry contest) (141–45)[22]. His presence in Greece is attested by an inscription at Eleusis (*IG*^{2} 2.3919), dating from not later than the middle of the first century C.E., and honouring a Πόπλιον Παπίνιον Στ[–]; because of the rarity of the *nomen* Papinius, this should almost certainly be restored to read Στ[άτιον][23]. The date would fit Statius' father, who died in late 79 at the age of about sixty-five (5.3.253–54), and was therefore born around 15, but not Statius himself, who was born around 50 or not much earlier[24].

---

[19] On the *toga praetexta* and the *bulla* see e.g. Blümner 1911: 221 with n. 17, 306 with n. 3. It should be noted that *sumere* in 119 is a correction by Markland for *ponere*: if *ponere* is retained, the reference must be to the deposition of the *toga praetexta* and the *bulla* on the assumption of the *toga uirilis* (Vollmer 1898: 536–37; cf. Blümner 1911: 336–37), which would not fit *Infantia* and disturb the chronological sequence. But even if the manuscript reading should be correct, equestrian rank would not be at issue.

[20] It is hardly likely that the ceremony described in 118–20 was the cause of the impoverishment (as is assumed by Hardie 1983: 6). There is no evidence at all for Hardie's further contention that Statius' grandfather was a businessman; he may just as well have been a landowner.

[21] This part of Statius' background has been strongly stressed by Hardie 1983, who at 15–36 discusses "The Greek Professional Poet".

[22] This passage has sometimes been interpreted as implying that Statius' father had *not* competed in Greece, but see Håkanson 1969: 148–49 for a refutation.

[23] See Clinton 1972.

[24] Statius talks of his approaching *senium* at 3.5.13, 24 and 4.4.70 (cf. 5.2.158–59), which he hardly could have done if he was not at least about forty-five years of

Another aspect of the activities of Statius the Elder (as the Eleusis inscription allows us to call him) was teaching. Well-born youths from the whole of Southern Italy came to Naples to be instructed by him in Greek poetry (146–75), and later on he transferred his school to Rome, where his pupils were likewise recruited from the elite (176–94)[25]. Statius specifies that he instructed the future members of the various priestly colleges in the ritual lore they would later need (178–84), and it is usually thought that here we have evidence, all the more precious for being unique, for religious education in Pagan Antiquity[26]. But this is a mirage: Statius is still speaking of the explication of poets, focusing on an aspect which indicates both the change from Greek to Latin poetry and the high social status of his father's pupils (priesthoods being very prestigious). All his references to ritual can be paralleled from Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*, and, conversely, the priesthoods which he fails to mention (such as that of the *epulones*) do not figure in Servius[27]. One of the priesthoods that he does mention is that of the *pontifices*:

age. Because these poems are from 94 and 95 respectively, the *terminus ante quem* for Statius' birth is ca. 50. His wife Claudia had a daughter from a first marriage, for whom in 94 she was anxious to find a husband (3.5.54–71), and who was therefore presumably approaching twenty (the normal marrying age for women being in their late teens: see Krause 1994: 21–34, Saller 1994: 25–41). So Claudia's second marriage with Statius took place after around 75, but, as was seen above, before or not long after he started writing the *Thebaid* in 78–79 (and, because Claudia is not mentioned in the poem to Statius the Elder, nor the Elder in the poem to Claudia, it may perhaps be guessed that Statius married after his father's death, in the beginning of the eighties). Statius at the time was *florentibus annis* and *adhuc iuuenile uagantem* (3.5.23–25), vague expressions, which however, hardly apply to a man of more than about thirty-five years of age. So the *terminus post quem* for Statius' birth is ca. 40 (or perhaps 45). A date nearer the *terminus ante quem* is perhaps preferable, because it would bring down the age at which Statius started on the *Thebaid* (cf. Aricò 1980: 17).

25 Vollmer 1898: 16, n. 1, and 541 wrongly denied the move to Rome; see Hilberg 1902, Frère 1961: 1.x–xi and 2.201, n. 4*.

26 See especially Cancik 1973.

27 The link with Servius was seen by Boyancé 1964: 344–45. It must be noted, however, that the interpretation of 182–83 is contested, and that the text may contain a corruption and/ or a lacuna at this point; see (apart from Boyancé) Schwartz 1889: 14–15, Bickel 1917–18 (followed by Frère 1961: 2.200, n. 5*, Önnerfors 1974: 112), and Cancik 1973: 186–87.

> Sub te Dardanius facis explorator opertae,
> qui Diomedei celat penetralia furti,
> creuit et inde sacrum didicit puer (178–80)

> The Trojan inspector of the hidden fire-brand, who keeps secret the sanctuary of Diomedes' theft, grew up under your guidance, and from you he learned the rites as a boy.

This refers to the supervision of the Vestal Virgins, who were in charge both of the eternal fire, brought from Troy, and of the Palladium, which according to one version had been stolen by Diomedes. Some sources (but not all) attribute either or both of these supervisions not to the college of *pontifices* as a whole, but specifically to its president, the *pontifex maximus*[28]; because the emperor was automatically *pontifex maximus*, it has been supposed that Domitian himself had been among the pupils of Statius' father[29]. But here we are again confronted with the chronological problem of the composition of the poem. If these lines are from late 79, the emperor was Titus[30]; they can only refer to Domitian if they form part of another later insertion, but in this case such an insertion is difficult to make out. Moreover, if Statius' father had taught the reigning emperor (whether Titus or Domitian), Statius would probably have capitalised on that, and it is more probable that his reference is to the college of the *pontifices* generally. Nevertheless, a connection with the Flavian house was established at some point, as is apparent from the sequel.

When in 69 the Capitol burnt as a result of the battle between the Vitellians and the Flavians, Statius' father immediately responded

---

[28] Plu. *Num.* 9 (cf. 10) speaks about the *pontifex maximus* alone, D.H. 2.66.3 (cf. 5) and 2.67.3 about "the *pontifices*" in the plural; in Liv. 28.11.6 a Vestal is punished by a *pontifex*, in Obsequ. 8 by a *pontifex maximus*. Cf. Wissowa 1912: 159, 508–12, Latte 1960: 108–10. According to Pliny, Domitian punished the *Vestalis maxima* Cornelia *pontificis maximi iure*, but not without convoking the other *pontifices* (*Ep.* 4.11.6).

[29] Curcio 1893: 8–9, accepted e.g. by Hardie 1983: 11. Cancik 1973: 184 suggests that Statius refers to a *promagister* who took care of the daily routine in representation of the emperor, but apart from the fact that a *promagister* is not attested before 155 (Wissowa 1912: 509, n. 1; cf. Latte 1960: 401), this seems not a natural way of taking the text.

[30] Titus was educated a the court of Claudius and taught "by the same teachers" as Britannicus (Suet. *Tit.* 2). One of these teachers could have been Statius the Elder, if his move to Rome took place before the mid-fifties.

with a poem, delivered, as Statius says, before the flames had subsided (195–202). From this fire the young Domitian had escaped in a manner that was far from glorious, but which was later stylised as a sign of the protection of Jupiter himself; Statius and Martial even make it appear as if Domitian won the war on behalf of Jupiter[31]. The first step in this idealisation may have been taken by Statius the Elder, whose poem was applauded by *Caesar* (203–04), with whom Domitian must be meant, because Vespasian entered Rome only in the autumn of 70[32]. The second step was then taken by Domitian himself, who also wrote a poem on these events (Mart. 5.5.7).

A further indication for favour from Domitian is more speculative. Statius' father was buried on an estate at Alba Longa (36–40), called "our fields" (37) by his son. It is likely that this estate had already belonged to the father, and possible that it was a gift from Domitian, who, as early as 70 (D.C. 66.3.4, 9.4) had a villa in the same place[33]. At some point, Statius received from Domitian the right to tap water from the aqueduct serving the imperial villa (3.1.61–64). In two later poems (4.5.1–22, 4.8.39), he uses his Alban estate to stage a self-presentation of the Horatian poet, enjoying a life of modest contentment in the country.

Statius' possession of the Alban estate is the only tangible clue to his material circumstances. We have seen in the Introduction that Juvenal pictured Statius as being on the brink of starvation; the dramatic date is during the lifetime of the pantomime dancer Paris, i.e. in 83 or earlier, and after Statius had begun giving recitations from the *Thebaid*, i.e. not before ca. 80 (7.82–87). But at that time he already owned the villa, because he buried his father there at the end of 79 (or the beginning of 80). For that reason alone Juvenal's description must be a satirical distortion. On the other hand, Statius says that he does not have the means to give his father a lavish funeral

[31] Cf. Tac. *Hist.* 3.74.1; Suet. *Dom.* 1.2; Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.79, *Theb.* 1.21–22; Mart. 9.101.14. See further p. 331.

[32] Hardie 1983: 12 with n. 78 assumes that the reference is to Vespasian, but apart from the chronological problem that this entails, the expression *ultor deorum* (203) is surely to be compared with such phrases as *suo gessit pro Ioue bella* (Mart. 9.101.14), applied to Domitian.

[33] The suggestion that the estate was an gift from the imperial family was made by Hardie 1983: 12–13, who, however, thought of Vespasian.

(41–63), and there is little reason to doubt his sincerity in this respect. Elsewhere, Statius calls himself *pauper* (1.4.127), which does not mean "poor" in the modern sense, but still is an antonym of *diues*, "rich"[34].

If we compare him with Martial, we note that the latter likewise called himself *pauper*, and likewise owned a small suburban estate[35]. Yet it is probable that Martial had greater material resources than Statius, because he was of equestrian rank, which Statius does not seem to have been. Higher status for Martial is also suggested by the irreverent tone in which he often addresses his patrons, and which is not just a consequence of the genre epigram, as is shown by the epigrams written for Roman patrons by Greeks. Statius, too, remained in a sense a Greek, the son of a Greek professional poet and schoolmaster, and himself not above competing in poetry contests, whether at the Augustalia in Naples or the Alban and Capitoline Games in Rome[36].

The other venues for Statius' performances were his recitations. Already as a youth he recited for senatorial audiences (5.3.215–24)[37], and later his readings from the *Thebaid* were huge social successes, as Juvenal attests. In *Silvae* 5.2 Statius anticipates holding recitations from a new epic, the *Achilleid* (36–37), a work about which he talks as being in its initial stages in three further poems (4.4.93–94, 4.7.21–24, 5.5.36–37), of which one (4.4) can be securely dated to the summer of 95. But the *Achilleid* as we have it breaks off early in the second book, which suggests that death overtook the poet, apparently around 96. This conclusion can be confirmed by a consideration of the *Silvae*.

---

[34] On the terms *pauper, paupertas*, see p. 54.

[35] On Martial see p. 52.

[36] Statius mentions having won at the Augustalia during his father's lifetime at 5.3.225–27; at 2.2.6–8 (from 90), he has just attended the Augustalia, but does not say whether as a spectator or as a participant. He mentions his victory in the Alban Games at 3.5.28–31, 4.2.65–67, 4.5.22–28, and 5.3.227–30, his defeat at the Capitoline games at 3.5.31–33 and 5.3.231–33. Romans of equestrian or senatorial status did not compete in these games: see White 1998, and cf. p. 334.

[37] Vollmer 1898: 17. n. 2 thinks that the *Latii patres* of 215 are the fathers of Statius' schoolmates, but they are certainly the same as the *Romulei patres* of 5.2.161, i.e. senators (cf. Frère 1961: 2.201, n. 4*).

We have seen that Statius planned on returning to Naples after the publication of Book 3. He published the book in 94, but he did not return, at least not immediately: there are poems in Book 4 which date from the winter of 94–95 and were written in Rome, although the book itself was eventually published from Naples in the summer of 95[38]. But it seems that Statius did not remain in Naples: in 4.7, which was written at a time when he was already at work on the *Achilleid* (21–24), he says that he is about to leave Naples for Rome (17–20). Moreover, two poems in Book 5 (5.1 and 5.2) show him based at Rome, although it must be admitted that these poems could have been written before the summer of 95[39]. On the other hand, they cannot be later than September 96, when Domitian was murdered, because they still contain fulsome praise of that emperor. For that reason, not only their composition, but also their publication must predate September 96, because the official attitude toward Domitian under Nerva and Trajan was fiercely hostile, and the publication of positive opinions is hardly conceivable and in any case not paralleled. Now Book 5 of the *Silvae* was published posthumously, as we have seen, and therefore Statius died at the end of 95 or in the first half of 96.

Asymmetry

When we now turn to the relationships entertained by Statius with his addressees, we must first note that Statius' own terminology for these relationships is not of much help. We saw at the beginning of this chapter that Statius uses the vocabulary of *amare* and *amicitia* for his (and his wife's) relationship with Abascantus (and Priscilla), but that this does not imply that that relationship was symmetrical.

---

[38] The poems in question are 4.1, 2, 6, 9. For the dates of Statius' poems see the Appendix.

[39] In the covering letter to 5.1, Statius hopes to enjoy the *amicitia* of Abascantus, which implies that he reckoned with remaining in Rome. The setting of 5.2, where Crispinus is about to depart for a holiday in Tuscany (1–2), is likewise Rome (cf. also 113). It is well possible that Statius merely spent the summer in Naples; his stays in Campania in the summers of 90 (2.2) and 91 (3.1) may be compared, the first occasioned by the Augustalia (2.2.6–8), but the second certainly not, because the Augustalia were held only once in four years.

So, no conclusion as to symmetry or asymmetry can be drawn from the circumstance that Statius uses the same vocabulary for others among his addressees: he is linked to both Arruntius Stella and his bride Violentilla by *amor* (1.2.256), Pollius Felix is an *amicus* (2.*ep*.14), and so is Crispinus (5.2.5), and Statius and Julius Menecrates are *amantes* (4.8.33)[40]. A case in point is the relationship with Maecius Celer, the addressee of poem 3.2, whom Statius not only calls "object of my love" (*nostri pignus amoris* [81; cf. 99]), but also his *rex*, i.e. his patron (92)[41].

Only in one other poem is Statius explicit about asymmetry. This is a jocular composition in hendecasyllables, written for the Saturnalia (4.9). The addressee, Plotius Grypus, had observed strict symmetry in the exchange of Saturnalian presents, and Statius illustrates the absurdity of this behaviour by reference to two of the major institutions of *amicitia*, the morning greeting (*salutatio*) and the evening meal (*cena*): if Statius has come to Grypus' *salutatio*, Grypus would never dream of going to salute Statius in return, nor, if he has entertained Statius at a sumptuous meal, would he ever expect to be invited to a similar *cena* himself (48–52)[42]. Statius here takes up the tradition of the Saturnalian poetry of Catullus and Martial, which, in accordance with the general character of the festival, offered playful treatments of asymmetry and reciprocity[43]. But normally he writes in a more serious vein, and does not openly discuss asymmetry (or reci-

---

[40] Cf. also 2.1.16 (Statius utters *preces* ... *amicas* to Atedius Melior), 4.4.21 (Gallus, the friend of the addressee Vitorius Marcellus, is *noster amor*), and 4.6.12 (*uerus amor* reigned at the board of Novius Vindex, at an occasion when Statius was present). For further expressions of closeness and affection see the section on duration.

[41] On *rex* as a term for "patron" see p. 16. Vollmer 1898: 401, followed by Frère 1961: 1.109, n. 3* (but not by Laguna 1992: 227), says that the word does not imply that Statius was Celer's client, and explains its use from the relationship of soldier to general imagined by Statius in the context. This is special pleading (cf. n. 42) and untenable, because a Roman army commander was never called *rex*.

[42] Vollmer 1898: 491, followed by Frère 1961: 2.134, n. 6* (but not by Coleman 1988: 238–39), denies that Statius was Grypus' client, because he reserves the term "client" for persons who had only a single patron; moreover he seems to think (18, n. 2) that this patron was called *patronus* by the client. On both points see Introduction, pp. 12–14.

[43] See pp. 184–188.

procity) as such. We need, therefore, to establish the respective social positions of his addressees.

Leaving aside the personal poems discussed above (3.5, 5.3–5), and postponing discussion of the emperor to Part III, we find eighteen different addressees, who receive twenty-two poems between them, which means that the great majority receive only a single poem[44]. It is not fully possible to rank these nineteen persons according to their social position, because Statius does not always supply the necessary evidence. This has to do with the circumstance that about half of his addressees did not pursue a political career, and in these cases Statius usually does not specify to what order the person in question belonged, nor does he give concrete figures as to wealth (although he never fails to make clear that it was considerable). For that reason, the most sensible procedure will be to distinguish the group of the careerists and the group of those living in retirement, and to discuss these separately, adding the imperial freedmen (such as Abascantus) as a third group. The careerists are all senatorial; equestrian careerists are absent, although Statius does address some younger equestrians who are socially ambitious, on behalf of their offspring if not on behalf of themselves, and these form a kind of transitional category, which will be discussed in its proper place. As for the senatorial careerists, of the six addressees answering to that description, only one, Rutilius Gallicus, is a consular, the other five are young men, of praetorian status at most; of these, four were to become consuls in the beginning of the following century, Arruntius Stella (*suff.* 101), Maecius Celer (*suff.* 101), Vitorius Marcellus (*suff.* 105), and Crispinus, the son of Vettius Bolanus, if he is the same as Clodius Crispinus (*cos.* 113); of the fifth, Plotius Grypus, nothing more is heard after Statius' poem. I will now discuss these senators in more detail, keeping to the order in which I have mentioned them.

C. Rutilius Gallicus, the addressee of *Silvae* 1.4, is known from a number of inscriptions alongside the poem by Statius[45]. Born around

---

[44] The exceptions are Atedius Melior (2.1, 3, 4), Pollius Felix (2.2, 3.1), and Claudius Etruscus (1.5, 3.3).

[45] His full style was Q. Julius Cordinus (C.) Rutilius Gallicus (see Salomies 1992: 116–17). The evidence on his life is collected and discussed in Syme 1984 and 1991c: 623–29; cf. also Henderson 1998: 3–36. Further bibliography in Alföldy 1999: 329.

26 in Augusta Taurinorum (Turin) (cf. 58–60) from a modest background (68–70), he had an exceptionally successful career: he was twice consul (*suff.* 71 or 72, II *suff.* 85[46]), and at the time Statius wrote he was Prefect of the City (*praefectus Vrbis*), formally the emperor's deputy at Rome. Statius gives a survey of what the duties of the City Prefect were (9–16), and stresses Gallicus' mildness in exercising his juridical and penal competencies (9–16, 42–48)[47]. A further emphasis is Gallicus' devotion to Domitian, which had been so great as to cause him to fall ill of overwork (54–56); Domitian in his turn had been anxious for the fate of his servant, and his prayers had of course been heard by the gods (4–8, 95–96). Gallicus recovered, and this was the occasion of Statius' poem (which was included in the *Silvae*, although Gallicus had soon relapsed and died: 1.*ep.*27–28)[48].

According to Statius' fiction, Gallicus was cured by the intervention of the gods of healing Apollo and Aesculapius, who, before they undertook their operation, had time to speak at length of their patient's biography: a speech by Apollo includes an extensive career review (68–93). Apollo begins by mentioning Gallicus' comparatively modest origins, his first steps in oratory (in which he was later to excel: 23–30), and his subsequent long and uninterrupted military service (68–75)[49]. The latter is then specified as a period of nine years' activity in Galatia, Pamphylia, Pannonia, and Armenia (76–79). At first sight Galatia, Pamphylia, and Armenia belong together, and a suspicion arises that Pannonia is mentioned out of order. This suspicion can be confirmed from a career inscription found at Ephesus, where it was inscribed on the base of an honorific statue now

---

[46] For the dating of the second consulate to 85 see Vidman 1982: 44, 79.

[47] On these competencies see Robinson 1992: 183–91. On the function's prestige, importance, and risks cf. Henderson 1998:25–32.

[48] A successor for Gallicus in the college of the Sodales Augustales was coopted in 92 (*ILS* 5025); the poem itself is to be dated between that date and the victory over the Dacians in 89 (mentioned at 91).

[49] Syme 1984: 152–53 = *RP* 5.517–18 (cf. 1991c: 628–29) proposed that 71–75 refer to an equestrian grandfather rather than to Gallicus himself, but this is not a logical way of taking the text. Moreover, *iurata manus* (74) need not denote an equestrian officer, as is shown by 5.2.176: *felix qui magno iam nunc sub praeside iuras* (addressing a *laticlauius*).

lost. Because of its extraordinary interest the inscription has to be quoted in full:

> C. Rutilio C. f./ Stel(latina) Gallico/ trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XIII/ Geminae, q(aestori), aedili curuli,/ legato diui Claudi leg(ionis) XV/ Apollinaris, pr(aetori), legato/ prouinciae Galaticae,/ sodali Augustali,/ consuli designato,/ M. Aemilius M. f. Pal(atina)/ Pius praef(ectus) coh(ortis) I Bosp(oranorum)/ et coh(ortis) I Hisp(anorum) legato (*ILS* 9499 = *I. Eph.* 3.715)

> To Gaius, son of Gaius, Rutilius Gallicus, of the Stellatina tribe, military tribune of legion XIII Gemina, quaestor, curule aedile, legate of the deified Claudius of legion XV Apollinaris, praetor, legate of the province Galatia, sodalis Augustalis, consul designate, (dedicated by) Marcus, son of Marcus, Aemilius Pius, of the Palatina tribe, prefect of cohort I of the Bosporani and of cohort I of the Hispani, to the legate.

Both legion XII Gemina and legion XV Apollinaris were at this stage of Gallicus' career stationed in Pannonia, and it appears that Gallicus was in Pannonia (even twice) before he went to Galatia. Neither Pamphylia nor Armenia occur in the inscription, but Pamphylia is probably mentioned by Statius because he believed (rightly or wrongly) that at that date it belonged to Galatia, whereas the inclusion of Armenia must imply that Gallicus participated in the famous campaigns against that country launched from Galatia (and Cappadocia) by Domitius Corbulo[50]. Nine years in all (perhaps three in Pannonia and six in Galatia) are not inconceivable.

The inscription is also important for the understanding of the next phase of Gallicus' career as described by Statius:

> Quid geminos fasces magnaeque iterata reuoluam
> iura Asiae? Velit illa quidem ter habere quaterque
> hunc sibi, sed reuocant fasti maiorque curulis
> nec permissa semel. (80–83)

[50] On Pamphylia Syme 1937b = *RP* 1. 42–46 argued Statius to have been in error (cf. also 1984: 154 = *RP* 5.518, 1991c: 623), but it cannot be excluded that Galatia and Pamphylia were put under one command a few years earlier than 69 (cf. Tac. *Hist.* 2.9). With respect to Armenia Syme 1984: 154 = *RP* 5.518 curtly states that "Gallicus had no part in the campaigns of Domitius Corbulo" (cf. 1991c: 624), but I do not know on what grounds (other than a wish to deny to Gallicus the military experience mentioned in 71–75: cf. n. 49).

> Why should I recount the twin *fasces* and the repeated jurisdiction over great Asia? She would certainly like to have him thrice and four times for herself, but he is recalled by the *fasti* and a greater curule chair, one that is not granted him just once.

The interpretation of these lines is dependent on the interpretation of the last word of the inscription. It used to be assumed that *legato* ("to the legate") refers to a legateship under the proconsul of Asia, the inscription having been set up in Asia's capital, Ephesus[51]. On this view, "the twin *fasces*" and "the repeated jurisdiction over great Asia" are synonymous expressions, denoting a prolonged tenure of the legateship[52]. Because Gallicus was already consul designate at the time of the inscription, "the *fasti* and a greater curule chair" by which he is "recalled", are his first consulship, of which it is at once specified that it would not remain his only one, so that due attention is paid to the prestigious second consulship.

Against this reconstruction it has been argued that the last word of the inscription cannot refer to a repeated legateship of Asia, because that should have been mentioned in the list of functions, before the designate consulship: "to the legate" must refer to the legateship of Galatia. So Aemilius Pius did not honour the legate of the province where he put up the statue, but the former legate of the province where he (formerly?) served. "The repeated jurisdiction over great Asia" cannot then refer to a legateship, but must refer to the proconsulate itself (which could be placed in 81/82 and 82/83 or in 82/83 and 83/84); because the consulate should be mentioned before the proconsulate, "the twin *fasces*" must mean Gallicus' two consulates, to the second, not the first, of which he would have been recalled from Asia[53].

---

[51] For this interpretation and the following reconstruction see esp. Groag, "Rutilius 19", *RE* 2.1 (1914), 1255–63 (followed by Frère 1961: 1.39, n. 4* and n. 6*), who, however, read *nec promissa semel* with M (*permissa* is a humanist correction), dating the poem to 89 and the second consulate to 90 (wrongly, as is now known: see n. 46).

[52] Vollmer 1898: 290 (after Mommsen 1887–88: 2.1.384, n.2) and Hardie 1983: 188 take the *geminos fasces* to refer to the praetorship, but this is wrong: see Eck 1985a: 478, with n. 15.

[53] This is the theory of Eck 1985a, which has been generally accepted, i.a. by Syme 1984: 151–52 = *RP* 5.516, with n. 16, and 1991c: 625, and Alföldy 1999: 329. Henderson 1998 still considers the old interpretation of *legato* possible (14), yet

Although perhaps removing some difficulties, this alternative hypothesis creates others. Apart from the question whether the consulate could be called "a greater curule chair" in comparison with the proconsulate of Asia, Statius' phrase "one that is not granted him just once" would now be attached to a reference to the second consulate: this would be otiose after "the twin *fasces*", and somewhat off-key, because one would have expected "not granted him for the first time". Moreover, the chronological sequence would be disturbed, because Statius has Apollo continue his account from the date of the first consulate. The next item in his review is Gallicus' mission to Africa (83–88), which inscriptions securely date to 74 (*AE* 1979, 648–49), and then follows his governorship of Germania Inferior (89–90), which is epigraphically attested for 78 (*ILS* 9052 = *CIL* 16.23)[54]. Both lie before the assumed proconsulate, which therefore seems seriously dislocated. Although this could be explained (e.g. by a wish to keep the two "doubled" magistracies together), some doubt about the new theory must remain. However, it matters little for the estimation of Gallicus' success: even if he should never have been *proconsul Asiae*, his career was highly distinguished, because it culminated in the *praefectura Vrbis*, which is also the climax of Apollo's account (91–93)[55]. In this capacity, he may have been prominently involved in the celebration of the Saecular Games of 88, which are repeatedly invoked in Statius' poem (e.g. 17–18, 95–97)[56]

To the achievements enumerated by Apollo another type of eminence should be added, mentioned by Statius in his own voice: literary distinction in verse and prose, to such a degree that Statius asks to be inspired not by the conventional deities of poetry, but by Gallicus himself (19–37). This combination of politics and poetry we will

speaks of the proconsulate as a matter not needing adstruction (e.g. 9–10, 18, 84). Indeed, it is logically possible that *Silv.* 1.4.80–81 refers to a proconsulate even if *legato* in the inscription refers to a legateship..

[54] The governorship probably lasted from 76–78: Eck 1985b: 145.

[55] It is not known at what date Gallicus became Prefect. Syme 1984: 151 = *RP* 5.516, 1988, and 1991c: 626 suggests 87, but his reconstruction is "hazardous", as he himself avows (1988: 615).

[56] Cf. Hardie 1983: 195–98 and 1996: 262–67; also Henderson 1998: 48–50 (and *passim*).

find again, never so clearly as with the addressee who is the next to be discussed.

L. Arruntius Stella, from Patavium (Padua), received an epithalamium (1.2) from Statius on the occasion of his marriage, in early 90, with Violentilla, about whom nothing else is known but that she was from Naples, very rich, and a widow[57]. He is also the dedicatee of Book 1, and in the dedicatory epistle he is immediately addressed as a poet; from the epithalamium it appears that he specialised in elegy (7–10, 250–55), more specifically love elegy (100–01). Statius asserts that Stella's love poems were very popular (172–73), and singles out for special mention a poem on his mistress' dove (102), which is also celebrated by Martial (7.14), and which, as can be gathered from the same Martial (1.7) and from Pliny (*Ep.* 9.25.2), gave its name to a collection[58]. Apart from being famous as a poet, Stella was also well-known as a host of poetic recitations and improvisations, to which Statius alludes with the words "his educated house knows how to listen" (50)[59]. But at the same time he was a politician, to which his patrician birth (71–72) predisposed him[60].

His political achievements at the time of the poem are listed by Venus in a speech with which she recommends young Stella to the hesitating Violentilla (173–81). She mentions that he is already a *XVuir sacris faciundis* (176–77), member of the priestly college that had been responsible for the recent celebration of the Saecular Games in 88[61], and she predicts that he will receive curulic office and the charge of organising the games with which Domitian's Dacian triumph will be celebrated (178–81). The dramatic date of her speech

---

[57] Stella's full name is revealed by *ILS* 6106 (the only inscription to mention him), the *patria* by Mart. 1.61.3–4. Violentilla's *patria* is mentioned by Statius at 260–65, her wealth described at 121–29 and 147–60; on her being a widow, on the marriage, and on Statius' epithalamium, see pp. 295–301. For bibliography on Stella see Alföldy 1999: 297, on Violentilla Raepsaet-Charlier 1987: 630–31.

[58] See p. 156 with n. 40. On Stella's poetry see also p. 300.

[59] On recitations see also Mart. 4.6, on improvisations 9.89, discussed at p. 100.

[60] Syme 1983c: 114 = *RP* 4.385 doubts whether *patriciis* in 69 should be taken literally, presumably because of Stella's slow progression towards the consulate (see immediately below).

[61] Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 11.11.1. Hardie 1996: 270–79 suggests that Stella composed the *carmen saeculare*, but the allusions he detects in *Silv.* 1.2 are unconvincing; Rutilius Gallicus would be a better candidate (cf. 1.4.96–97).

lies some time before the wedding, and when the poem was written, her predictions had of course been fulfilled[62]. It is not clear in what capacity Stella organised the triumphal games: one may think of a special *cura ludorum*, such as an earlier Arruntius Stella (probably his grandfather) received from Nero in 55 (Tac. *Ann.* 13.22.1), but that seems to have been an equestrian appointment[63]. In any case, Stella's appointment was a mark of imperial favour, as Statius stresses.

Stella's career after his marriage can be partly reconstructed with the help of Martial, who addresses him in a large number of epigrams[64]. In 93 he again organised games, this time to celebrate Domitian's return from the campaign against the Sarmatians (Mart. 8.78). Here, too, it is not clear in what capacity he did so, but because Martial makes it clear that he financed the games himself, it may have been that he was praetor, and simply declared that the games he had to give in that capacity were in honour of Domitian's return (which was not formally celebrated as a triumph). A praetorship in 93 would fit the date of Stella's consulate, mentioned by Martial in a dedication poem of Book 12 (2 [3].10), published in 101; this date has now been confirmed by considerations of epigraphy[65]. After his consulate, Stella's trace is lost: he is not mentioned by Pliny, who was his colleague in the praetorship (if he was indeed praetor in 93)[66], but became suffect consul a year earlier (in 100); normally one would have expected the patrician Stella to be the more successful of the two (and to gain an ordinary, not a suffect consulate), but his closeness to the old regime may not have been a recommendation in the eyes of Trajan.

---

[62] With respect to the curulic office, this is denied by Vollmer 1898: 253 (followed by Frère 1961: 1.26, n. 1), but wrongly, because it is mentioned *before* the organisation of the games; the aedileship is probably meant, because Stella seems to have become praetor only in 93 (see below).

[63] On the giving of games by magistrates and others see Mommsen 1887–88: 2.1.236–38, 2.2.951–52, Hirschfeld 1905: 285–89.

[64] See pp. 58 and 155–159.

[65] On the publication of Book 12 see pp. 115–116. Considerations of epigraphy: Eck 1970: 148–49, n. 152 (cf. Eck 1982: 327, n. 181), Zevi 1979: 197.

[66] For the debate on the date of Pliny's praetorship see Birley 2000: 10–14 (who himself, following Harte 1935, opts for 89 or 90).

Silvae 3.2 is addressed to a Maecius Celer, on the occasion of his leaving Italy to take up a post as legionary legate in Syria in 90 or 91 (cf. 3.*ep*.12–13, 3.2.104–06, 121–22)[67]. Two Maecii Celeres are known in this period: M. Maecius Celer, who is attested in the acts of the Arval Brethren as suffect consul on April 26, 101 (*CFA* 62a.73), and L. Roscius Aelianus Maecius Celer, probably his first cousin, suffect consul the year before; because the career of the latter (as revealed by *ILS* 1025) cannot be reconciled with Statius' poem, his addressee must be the former[68]. Statius calls him *nobilis* (3.2.20), which suggests that he was of senatorial descent; in any case he embarked on a senatorial career as *tribunus laticlauius* in Syria, the same province in which he later was to become commander (123–26)[69]. Statius does not mention any other posts than these two, but expresses hopes of higher employment (127–28), hopes which were indeed fulfilled, as testified by the consulate in 101.

Vitorius Marcellus, addressee of *Silvae* 4.4 as well as dedicatee of Book 4, hailed from Teate in the country of the Marrucini (85–86), modern Chieti. He is known from the *Fasti Ostienses* to have been suffect consul in 105[70]; it is possible that he is the Marcellus who around 120 is attested as proconsul of Africa[71], but at the time of the poem, in 95, he was only praetor, and had just been designated *cura-*

---

67 Laguna 1992: 193 and 235 seems to think that Celer went as *tribunus laticlauius*, but he misreads 121–28. In the prosopographical literature the date is wrongly given as 93–94 (based on the date of publication of the book rather than on the date of composition of the poem): thus Alföldy 1969: 76–78, Syme 1980a: 8, Syme 1982–83: 243 = *RP* 4.96, *PIR*² M 51.

68 That the two were first cousins was suggested by Syme 1985c: 194 = *RP* 5.642, correcting his earlier statement 1982–83: 243 = *RP* 4.96 that they were probably brothers. Neither of them is identical with the Celer of Mart. 7.52, who is a different person altogether: see Eck 1970: 226–27, n. 479 and Syme 1980a: 28–31 (cf. Eck 1982: 310, n. 121), refuting Alföldy 1969: 76–78.

69 In 3.*ep*.11–12 Statius calls him *splendidissimum ... iuuenem*, but by this time the term *splendid(issim)us* was not yet restricted to equestrians; see Demougin 1975: 176 with n. 16 for further examples.

70 See Vidman 1982: 46, 99. Because the *Fasti Ostienses* (as well as a military diploma) have revealed his *praenomen* to be "Marcus", there is no longer any need to emend *M. Vitori* at Quint. *Inst.* 1.*pr*.6, 4.*pr*.1, 6.*pr*.1, and 12.11.31 to *Marcelle Vitori* (after *ep. Tryph.* 1), as is still done in all editions: see Salomies 1982.

71 Cf. Syme 1980b: 5 = *RP* 3.1306, Eck 1983: 154, n. 353.

tor uiae Latinae (59–60)[72]. Statius makes much of his qualities as an orator (39–45, 64–65), but in the same breath states that he is no poet (46–49). Yet he must have taken an active interest in literary life, because Statius assumes that he will defend Book 4 of the *Silvae* against criticisms (4.*ep.*34), and asks for his advice on whether to go on with the *Achilleid* or to undertake an epic on Domitian instead (4.4.93–100)[73]. He may also be the recipient of a "letter to Marcellus" by the famous grammarian Probus on the accentuation of such Punic names as *Hannibal* and *Hasdrubal* (Gel. 4.7), a subject which he may have discussed with his old school friend (*condiscipulus*: 4.*ep.*12) Septimius Severus, who was of partly Punic descent[74]. But the most impressive testimony to Marcellus' literary interests is that he received the dedication of the *Institutio oratoria* from Quintilian, who not only wished to honour Marcellus' close friendship and his passionate love of literature, but also to contribute to the education of his small son Geta (1.*pr.*6; cf. 4.*pr.*1). This boy, in whom high hopes were apparently set, is also mentioned by Statius, in lines which contain precious information on Marcellus' marital connections, but need to be carefully elucidated:

Nos facta aliena canendo
uergimus in senium: propriis tu pulcher in armis
ipse canenda geres paruoque exempla parabis
magna Getae, dignos quem iam nunc belliger actus
poscit auus praestatque domi nouisse triumphos.
Surge agedum iuuenemque puer deprende parentem,
stemmate materno felix, uirtute paterna. (69–75)

I, while singing the deeds of others, (70) am sinking into old age, but you, handsome in your own arms, will yourself perform deeds to be sung, and will provide great examples for little Geta, of whom already now his warlike grandfather demands worthy actions, granting him to learn of triumphs while still at home. Come on, rise up, boy, and over-

[72] Correctly interpreted by Coleman 1988: 135–36 against White 1973b: 280. There is no need to doubt that by this time the curatorship of a road was already a regular post: cf. Mart. 10.18 (17), on someone in charge of the Via Appia.

[73] Cf. p. 286 with n. 110.

[74] For Septimius Severus, see below, pp. 218–220. Statius also mentions another friend, Gallus, with possessions at Luna (20–25), who cannot be identified (cf. Syme 1968: 148 = *RP* 2.717).

take your young parent, blessed in the lineage of your mother and the valour of your father.

In the acts of the Arval Brethren we find a C. Vitorius Hosidius Geta, who quickly advanced to be master of the brotherhood in 120 (*CFA* 68–69, 71, 74–75)[75]. This name fits Marcellus' son, and also suggests the name of the grandfather mentioned by Statius: C. Hosidius Geta. A man of that name who could tell of triumphs is indeed on record: a C. Hosidius Geta was given the *ornamenta triumphalia* by Claudius for valorous behaviour in Britain in 43 (D.C. 60.20.4[76]). This man is not elsewhere on certain attestation, but an inscription from Histonium (Vasto), the home of the Hosidii (and not far from Marcellus' Teate), has been plausibly assigned to him (*ILS* 971); apart from the *ornamenta triumphalia*, this inscription also speaks of the further honour of adlection into the patriciate[77].

A problem has been detected in the great age of the grandfather and in the late date at which he must have become a father, but both can be paralleled from elsewhere in the *Silvae*. C. Hosidius Geta seems to have been a coeval of Vespasian and his brother Sabinus (D.C. 60.20.3–4) and therefore to have been born around 8 C.E., which would make him about eighty-seven in 95. But the father of Claudius Etruscus, mourned in *Silvae* 3.3, died when he was nearly ninety (Mart. 7.40.6)[78]. Geta's mother cannot have been born before 65, because she must have been younger than her husband, who, as praetor, was about thirty-two at the time of the poem in 95; if she was indeed the daughter of C. Hosidius Geta, she was born when her father was in his late fifties. But Crispinus, the addressee of *Silvae* 5.2 (to be discussed presently), was sixteen (or even fifteen) in 95 or 96, therefore born around 80; his father, Bolanus (*suff.* 66), must have been born in the twenties, which yields a similar interval of fifty to sixty years. So there is no need to resort to desperate reme-

[75] He seems to have become consul around 126 or around 130, but the precise reconstruction of his career is very difficult: see Scheid 1990: 379–84.

[76] In the editions the manuscript reading Γαῖος is changed (with Reimarus) to Γναῖος, but the distinction between C. Hosidius Geta (*PIR*^{2} H 217) and Cn. Hosidius Geta (*PIR*^{2} H 216) should be upheld.

[77] For discussion see Birley 1981: 222–24 (also on the birth date, mentioned below).

[78] See below, p. 230, with n. 132.

dies, such as assuming that the grandfather is dead, and that it is only the memory of him which fires on young Geta, or making *auus* mean "great-grandfather" rather than "grandfather", or re-writing the text[79]. We may safely believe that Marcellus married the daughter of a patrician and a triumphator, so that he had indeed good grounds to be optimistic for the future of his son.

Crispinus, the son of Vettius Bolanus, was sixteen or fifteen (as has just been said), when Statius wrote *Silvae* 5.2 to congratulate him on his appointment as a legionary tribune (but without specifying the legion or the province)[80]. He was a patrician (28), and that explains that he was already a member of the exclusive priesthood of the Salians (129–31). It also fits his presumed identity with the C. Clodius Crispinus who was ordinary consul in 113, because a patrician could expect to become ordinary consul in his early thirties[81]. This identification is further supported by the circumstance that a M. Vettius Bolanus was ordinary consul in 111, and that Statius speaks of a brother who was somewhat more advanced in his career than Crispinus (125–26)[82]. The older brother had taken the *cognomen* of the father, whose distinguished career is extolled at length by Statius: legionary legate under Corbulo in the wars against the Armenians (31–50, 141), governor of Britain (54–56, 142–49), and proconsul of Asia (56–58)[83]. But he died before Crispinus took the *toga uirilis*, leaving him exposed to the wiles of his mother, who tried to poison him, and was condemned to death by Domitian (77–97). Statius stresses Crispinus' forgiving disposition (82–96), together with more

---

[79] The first is done by Postgate 1906: 307 (cf. Håkanson 1969: 120, who translates "whom already <the thought of> his glorious grandfather spurns on", but does not seem to imply that the grandfather is dead), the second by Coleman 1988: 137 and 151, the third by van Dam 1992: 209–12.

[80] The age depends on the interpretation of 12–13: *ut octonos bis iam tibi circumit orbes/ uita*, which does not make quite clear whether the sixteenth year has already been completed.

[81] The identification was reported in *PIR*^{2} C 1164 and is believed to be "beyond doubt" by Syme 1985c: 196 = *RP* 5.644; cf. also Salomies 1992: 154. It would explain why the title of the poem is not *Laudes Vetti Crispini Bolani filii*, but *Laudes Crispini Vetti Bolani filii* (perhaps *Clodi* has fallen out before *Crispini*).

[82] The old misconception, inspired by 65 and 75, that the brothers were twins, was refuted by White 1973b: 282.

[83] On Bolanus' career see Birley 1981: 62–65.

conventional virtues and attainments: his interest in poetry (71), including that of Statius (160–63), his early debut as an orator (98–110), his horsemanship (111–24), and his close friendship with a certain Optatus (152–59), who, in spite of the rarity of the name, cannot be further identified[84].

Plotius Grypus, the addressee of the Saturnalian poem 4.9, was also senatorial, as appears from the preface to Book 4, where he is called "a young man of the higher rank" (*maioris gradus iuueni*: 4.*ep*.22) compared to Julius Menecrates, who was equestrian (4.8.59–62). Moreover, the extreme rarity of the *cognomen* makes it almost certain that he was related to D. Plotius Grypus (*suff.* 88)—if he was his son, he automatically belonged to the senatorial order[85]. It may surprise that Statius does not explicitly mention the father, if he was a consular, but the poem is only a Saturnalian joke, and Statius would certainly have given more particulars in the "composition more worthy of him" (*dignius opusculum*) which he promised for the near future (4.*ep*.23)[86]. But he does manage to slip in a short sketch of young Grypus' own achievements: early excellence as an orator (14–16), like Rutilius Gallicus, Vitorius Marcellus, and Crispinus, and after that an appointment from Domitian, described in the following terms:

> te Germanicus arbitrum sequenti
> annonae dedit omniumque late
> praefecit stationibus uiarum (17–19)

> Germanicus [i.e. Domitian] appointed you as controller of the corn-supply of his train and put you in charge of the stopping-stages of all the roads far and wide.

Because Grypus was senatorial, this cannot refer to the equestrian post of *praefectus uehiculorum*, and Statius must be speaking of some kind of special command, which put Grypus in charge of the provisioning of the imperial army on campaign, probably during the

---

[84] Syme 1978: 592–93 = *RP* 3.1108–09 gives a thought to a descendant of the imperial freedman Ti. Iulius Optatus Pontianus who was prefect of the fleet at Misenum under Claudius.

[85] See Chastagnol 1973.

[86] So it is not necessary to conjecture that the father had fallen into disgrace, as is done by Bérard 1984: 271–72 and B.W. Jones 1992: 190–91.

expedition against the Sarmatians in 92[87]. The post must have allowed of close contact with the emperor, but in how far Grypus has been able to make good use of this opportunity, we do not know. After Statius' poem he does not reappear in our sources; whether because of death, disfavour, or the accidents of the transmission, it is impossible to tell.

Apart from Rutilius Gallicus, all these senatorial addressees were young men, some of them very young: Maecius Celer (praetorian) and Vitorius Marcellus (praetor) were in their early thirties, Arruntius Stella was in his late twenties, Plotius Grypus probably in his early twenties, and Crispinus in his teens. We find a similar concentration of young men among those addressees whom Statius explicitly characterises as equestrians: Claudius Etruscus, Septimius Severus, Vibius Maximus, and Julius Menecrates; of these only Vibius Maximus may have been middle-aged. Claudius Etruscus will be most conveniently discussed in connection with his father, the imperial freedman; the others will be taken in the order in which I have just mentioned them (which is the order in which they occur in the fourth book of the *Silvae*).

Septimius Severus is said by Statius to be "among the most distinguished men of the second [i.e. the equestrian] order" (4.*ep.*11–12). From the poem addressed to him (*Silv.* 4.5), it appears that he was a wealthy man, who owned at least three estates, one in Etruria and two in Latium (53–56)[88]. There he devoted himself to *quies* and literary pursuits, in particular the composition of prose; but Statius encourages him not to neglect lyric poetry (57–60), and the form of Statius' own poem, which is a Horatian ode, may have been inspired by his addressee's favourite genre. Septimius Severus' literary interests also showed when he supported Statius at the poetry competition of the Alban Games (22–28)[89]. Oratory he practised only occasion-

---

[87] Thus Bérard 1984: 259–82, 298–301, against Eck 1975: 383–85 and Pflaum 1982: 18–21. The controversy is summarised by Coleman 1988: 221–24 and *PIR*² P 505.

[88] Moreover, 17–20 may hint that he owns large flocks and herds (cf. Hardie 1983: 180).

[89] There is just a possibility that he is identical with the Severus of Mart. 11.57, who is a poet, and with other Severi in Martial, but the *cognomen* is too common to allow of any confidence.

ally, and only on behalf of friends (49–52). But his greatest merit seems to have been to be *not Punic*, neither in speech, nor in bearing, nor in mentality (45–46). This suggests of course that he *was* Punic (at least in part), and indeed Statius says that he had been born in Lepcis Magna (in modern Libya), but had come to Rome as a boy, where he had been educated with the aristocracy, although himself content to remain a knight (29–48). There can be no doubt that he was related to the Septimius Severus from Lepcis Magna who was to become emperor two generations later, and the question has been asked whether he could actually have been the grandfather; the answer is of consequence for our understanding of the nature of his *quies*.

An inscription from Lepcis Magna (*IRT* 412) attests two things about the emperor's grandfather, apart from his name, L. Septimius Severus: that he had served on the jury panels at Rome and that he had become *sufes* and later *duouir* in his native city, *sufes* being the Punic name of the highest local magistracy, changed into the Latin *duouir* when the city became a *colonia* under Trajan. It has been argued against the identification of this man with Statius' addressee that jury service is not mentioned by Statius and that his Septimius Severus preferred a secluded life, with only occasional appearances in court as a lawyer[90]. This is a serious objection, yet we cannot quite exclude that Statius' addressee did do jury service, but that this occurred either after the time of Statius' poem, or that it was too prosaic to be admitted into a lyric celebration of his identity as a literary man. On the other side, there is the name of the emperor's father, Septimius Geta, which conspicuously recalls that of the son of Vitorius Marcellus, a school friend of Statius' addressee[91]. This could mean that the emperor's grandfather is indeed identical with Statius' addressee, and that the latter had either married a daughter of Vitorius Marcellus or named his child in honour of his friend[92]. So it is

[90] See Barnes 1967: 87–89, Coleman 1983 and 1988: 158–59. On the jury panels see Millar 1992: 282–83.

[91] See above, p. 215.

[92] For this and other arguments in favour of the following reconstruction see Birley 1988: 17–23, 220. Honorific naming would find a parallel in the Herodian dynasty in Judaea, who also named some of their children after their Roman acquaintances (Agrippa, etc.): see Mitchell 1998.

possible that at some time later than Statius' poem his addressee went back to his home town to marry and found a family[93], called his children after his old Roman friends, and engaged in municipal politics, becoming *sufes* and *duouir*. If this was indeed the case, his *quies* in the end proved to have been only temporary.

Vibius Maximus, another of Statius' equestrian addressees, is likewise the recipient of an Horatian ode (*Silvae* 4.7): the poem congratulates him on the birth of his first child (29–32), and at the same time asks him to return from Dalmatia (13–16; cf. 4.*ep.*18–19). In the older literature Statius' addressee was universally identified with the Vibius Maximus who was prefect of Egypt from 103 to 107, but that cannot be correct[94]. The only post that Statius mentions is a *praefectura alae* (45–48), one of the three *militiae equestres*, which were the bottom rung of the equestrian career. His addressee could only have become prefect of Egypt in 103 if by the time of the poem (94 or 95) he had moved well beyond the *militiae equestres*, and for that reason it used to be assumed that the reason for his stay in Dalmatia was a procuratorship. But Statius' language implies that Maximus was at liberty to leave the province when he pleased, so he cannot have been on official mission; moreover, Dalmatia was his native land (as appears from 17–20), which suggests that the reason for his stay there was the more private one of founding a family[95]. This he seems to have done only at a comparatively late age, because Statius includes a long development on the disadvantages of childlessness (33–40), which would hardly be appropriate to a young man. Middle age would also fit the *dignitas* that Statius attributes to him in the preface to Book 4 (4.*ep.*16)[96].

---

[93] This would fit the chronology, because the emperor was born only in 145.

[94] See White 1973c. Accepted by Syme 1985: 327–28 = *RP* 5.444–45 and Coleman 1988: 195–97, missed by Hardie 1983: 172–74.

[95] Coleman 1988: 196 aptly compares the *Annaei*: both Seneca and Lucan were born at Corduba from parents mainly resident in Rome. If the reconstruction of the life of Septimius Severus offered above is correct, he too went back home to found a family.

[96] Middle age would also allow identification of Statius' addressee with P. Vibius Maximus, *eq. R.* from Epitaurum (near Dubrovnik), who appears as a witness on a military diploma from 71 (*ILS* 1991 = *CIL* 16.14).

Vibius Maximus' *dignitas* cannot have been due to his career, because he had not advanced beyond the *militiae equestres*, but must have been connected with other factors. Apart from age, perhaps wealth, even if not mentioned by Statius. Then, an advantageous marriage: the father-in-law had played a leading role (or so Statius implies) in Domitian's campaign against the Sarmatians (49–52)[97]. Finally, and most importantly, eloquence (4.*ep.*16): Statius ends his poem with mention of a brief world history composed by Maximus (57–60)[98]. This combination of social and literary assets will have occasioned Statius to accept Maximus' guidance in the composition of the *Thebaid* and *Achilleid* and to advertise that fact, both in this poem (21–28) and in a letter about the publication of the *Thebaid* (4.*ep.*17–18), which is unfortunately lost[99].

Julius Menecrates, the addressee of *Silvae* 4.8, is likewise congratulated with the birth of a child, in his case the third (3–4, 20–23, 35); unlike Vibius Maximus, he was still young (26). He was a citizen of Naples (4.*ep.* 19–22), a wealthy member of the local aristocracy (3–5, 59), and of equestrian rank (4.*ep.*20–22, 4.8.59–62). Statius does not mention any activities in municipal politics[100], but ends his poem with hopes of social advancement for the three children: he predicts that the daughter will marry a patrician (at her first marriage, not, like her townswoman Violentilla, after having been married before), and that the two sons will be admitted to the senate (59–62).

---

[97] But it would be hazardous to think of the governor of Pannonia, at that time probably Neratius Priscus the Elder (*suff.* 87); cf. Syme 1985a: 328 = *RP* 5.444–45.

[98] Statius hopes that Maximus' son will read his father's work, but that does not imply that it was specifically written for the instruction of the young, as held by Coleman 1982 and 1988: 208–09. Coleman is right, however, in stressing that the work was not an epitome; perhaps it was in the nature of the world history of Florus, which is not an epitome in spite of being known as *Epitome de Tito Livio*. Cf. Hose 1994: 452–53.

[99] The literary interests of Statius' addressee speak against his identification with the Vibius Maximus of Mart. 11.106, who is presented (even if jokingly) as a less than enthusiastic reader of poetry. Moreover, Martial's addressee is *occupatus* (2), which suggests a career and identification with the future prefect of Egypt (cf. Syme 1985a: 329 = *RP* 5.445). With other Maximi in Martial (or Pliny) nothing can be done, because the *cognomen* is too common.

[100] Whether 45–54 allude to local priesthoods, as is suggested by Hardie 1983: 68, must remain uncertain.

The latter would presuppose that the emperor would grant them the *latus clauus*, and Statius duly invokes the favour of Domitian (61–62). There is an indication in the poem that Menecrates did indeed enjoy this favour, because Statius says that he had been granted the "right of three children" (*ius trium liberorum*) (20–21), for which he would have needed a broker at court. Unfortunately, the identity of that broker cannot be guessed.

It has been suggested that Menecrates had been a pupil of Statius' father, but this is difficult chronologically[101]. It is much more likely that the contact had been established by Menecrates' father-in-law, Pollius Felix, who is repeatedly alluded to in the poem (6–11, 57–58). Moreover, Pollius' wife Polla is also mentioned (13–14), and so is a son, maternal uncle (*auunculus*) of Menecrates' children, who had been decorated as an equestrian officer in North Africa (12)[102]. The son does not occur elsewhere in the *Silvae*, but Pollius is the recipient of two poems, and Polla perhaps of a third.

The poems for Pollius Felix concern his luxurious villa at Surrentum (Sorrento) (2.2) and a splendid temple of Hercules that he had built on the precincts of that villa (3.1)[103]. The themes of the poems already suggest that Pollius did not pursue a career, but lived a life of cultured leisure. It had not always been so: Statius recounts that as a young man he had been a magistrate both in Puteoli (Pozzuoli), where he had been born, and in Naples, where he had acquired citizenship (2.2.96–97), and had been a generous benefactor to both cities (2.2.133–37, 3.1.91–93; cf. 4.8.57–58)[104]. But that was in his youth (2.2.137); since then, he has become an Epicurean (2.2.123–32, 138–42), living in *quies* (2.2.140, 3.*ep*.2), and devoting

---

[101] Vessey 1973: 22 and 1974a: 257. If Menecrates was around thirty-five at the time of the poem (ca. 94), he was born ca. 60, whereas Statius the Elder transferred his school to Rome well before 69 (see above, pp. 200–201).

[102] On the *auunculus* see Coleman 1988: 212, who, however, wrongly considers identification with a M. Pullius recorded as *duouir* in Puteoli in 104 (*CIL* 10.1781): the year is B.C.E., not C.E.

[103] Remains of the villa (but not of the temple) have been identified: see Mingazzini and Pfister 1946: 54–70, 132–33 (correcting Beloch 1890: 269–74 and *apud* Vollmer 1898: xii).

[104] Pollius' early political activity will be discussed in greater detail at p. 317.

himself to the pursuit of poetry (2.2.112–20), often in the company of Statius (3.*ep*.3–6)[105].

Pollius obviously had no difficulties in financing such an existence: Statius apostrophises him as an enormously wealthy man (2.2.121–22; cf. 3.1.166), and mentions various other possessions apart from the villa at Surrentum: a second Campanian villa near Pausilypon (Posillipo), called *Limon* ("Meadow") (2.2.81–82; cf. 110, 3.1.149)[106], a further villa at Tibur (Tivoli) (2.2.109–10), and possessions at Tarentum (Taranto), paraphrased as "vineyards of the Galaesus" (2.2.111). Because the name of the river Galaesus is often associated with high-quality wool, Statius may hint that Pollius owned flocks as well as vineyards in the Tarentan neighbourhood[107]. Statius also speaks of viticulture on the grounds of the Surrentine villa (2.2.4–5, 98–106), and this, too, may have been among the sources of Pollius' wealth[108]. But Pollius need not have been a member of the landed gentry from birth: it is very well possible that he (or his father) had originally become rich through commercial activities in the busy port of Puteoli—activities which do not qualify for inclusion in a poetic celebration[109].

Conspicuous prominence in the poems to Pollius Felix is accorded to his wife Polla (2.2.10, 147–46 [as transposed]; 3.1.87, 158–62, 179; cf. 4.8.13–14). Nowhere else in the *Silvae* is the wife of an addressee even mentioned (apart from 1.2, on the occasion of a marriage, and 5.1, on the occasion of the wife's death), and this suggests that Polla was a patron of Statius in her own right. Now, there is only one woman among his addressees (apart from his own wife), and she

---

105 Pollius' Epicureanism, *quies*, and poetry will be discussed in greater detail at pp. 318–321.

106 This villa is epigraphically attested: *ILS* 5798.

107 For the associations of *Galaesus* see Hor. *C.* 2.6.10–11, Mart. 13.125, 2.43.3, 4.28.3, 5.37.2, 8.28.3–4, 12.63.3, Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.93; viticulture near Tarentum is mentioned e.g. at Hor. *C.* 2.6.18–20 and Mart. 13.125. See further Nisbet and Hubbard 1978: 100–01 and 104.

108 On Surrentine wine see Kißel 1990: 471.

109 Cf. D'Arms 1970: 125–26, 161–62, 220–21, and 1981: 83, 87. D'Arms further suggests that Pollius was a freedman's son (1974: 111), an attractive hypothesis, but far from certain (yet accepted as fact by N. Purcell in Frederiksen 1984: 324 and by Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 342). On Statius' treatment of commerce see pp. 309–311.

is called Polla. This is the recipient of *Silvae* 2.7, Argentaria Polla, the widow of the poet Lucan, and probably the daughter or granddaughter of M. Argentarius, a Greek epigrammatic poet who also held declamations in Latin[110]. The idea that she is the same as Polla, the wife of Pollius, is already an old one, but it has recently been revived with new arguments[111]. The most compelling of these concerns the following lines from Statius' address to Polla, the wife of Pollius:

> non tibi sepositas infelix strangulat arca
> diuitias auidique animum dispendia torquent
> fenoris: expositi census et docta fruendi
> temperies. (2.2.151–54)

> yours is not an unhappy coffer, smothering deposited riches, and your mind is not tormented by losses of greedy loans: your capital is exposed, and you have learned how to enjoy it with moderation.

First, these lines again suggest that Polla was a patron of Statius: whenever a poet praises the proper use of wealth, he inevitably hints that he himself would be a worthy beneficiary. More importantly, Statius uses banking terminology, which is significant in respect of his inveterate tendency to pun on proper names (here perhaps also seen in *infelix*): the Latin for "banker" is *argentarius*[112]. So there is a strong presumption that the Polla who is here addressed is indeed Argentaria[113].

Before accepting the identification as possible, its consequences should be considered for the reconstruction of Argentaria Polla's

---

[110] That Argentaria Polla was the daughter or (on chronological grounds) rather the granddaughter of M. Argentarius is persuasively argued by Nisbet 1978: 5–7.

[111] See Nisbet 1978. Nisbet's theory was accepted by Hardie 1983: 4, 60, but van Dam 1984: 277, 454–55 (cf. 1986: 2736) and Hemelrijk 1999: 132–35 are sceptical.

[112] Nisbet 1978: 8 gives an inventory of Statius' puns on proper names, to which I will suggest some additions below, p. 230, n. 134 (Henderson 1998: 17 suggests additions for *Silv.* 1.4). Speaking of Argentaria Polla, Statius may pun on her name at 2.*ep.*23–24, using the book-keeping term *imputare* (Nisbet 7), although he uses that same term in a similar context when addressing Vitorius Marcellus (4.*ep.*15).

[113] Van Dam 1984 objects that Statius could have used the word *argentum* if he had wished to pun on Argentaria's name (277), and that he does not pun on her name in 2.7 (455). But one should surely allow Statius to pun where and how he likes (and he does probably pun on Argentaria's name at 2.*ep.*23–24 [see n. 112], as van Dam admits [62]).

relationship with Martial, who also contributed (7.21–23) to the ceremony which occasioned *Silvae* 2.7: a commemoration of what would have been Lucan's birthday[114]. Argentaria must have been a connection from Martial's first year in Rome (64–65), when he cultivated the patronage, of the family of Lucan's uncle Seneca (4.40.2–3)[115]. But Martial and Polla do not seem to have been in frequent contact afterwards. Apart from the poems on Lucan's birthday he addresses only one other epigram to her, which begins: "If you light upon my little books, queen Polla" (*Contigeris, regina, meos si, Polla, libellos* (10.64.1). This formula, which finds its only parallel in an epigram to the emperor[116], would find an easy explanation if Polla were resident in Campania. So the evidence from Martial accords well with the hypothesis that she is the same person as Polla, the wife of Pollius.

That Argentaria Polla organised a celebration in honour of Lucan is no objection to the identification, not even that she kept a bust of him in her bedroom (*Silv.* 2.7.128–131)[117]. We may compare the wife of Statius himself, who is praised by him for continuing to mourn her first husband after she had become his (3.5.50–54). So, even if Argentaria Polla had married again, her attitude would have been acceptable and even laudable. Notwithstanding her devotion to Lucan, the great Stoic poet, she may well have found relief, after his untimely and violent death, in the quieter company of an Epicurean versifier. The wife of Pollius is characterised in Epicurean terms (2.2.150), and signs of Epicureanism have also been detected in Statius' poem to Lucan's widow; unfortunately, these signs are not unequivocal enough to clinch the identification[118]. I will therefore treat it as a plausible hypothesis, but not as fact.

---

[114] On chronological grounds the birthday cannot have been the fiftieth, as is often believed: in that case Statius' poem would have to be dated to October 89, but it is certainly contemporaneous with Mart. 7.21–23, from 91 or 92.

[115] On Martial's first year in Rome, see p. 86.

[116] *Contigeris nostros, Caesar, si forte libellos* (1.4.1).

[117] On the interpretation of these lines see van Dam 1984: 503–04.

[118] See Nisbet 1978: 9–11, and the scepsis of van Dam 1984: 504–06.

Another Epicurean addressee, who, like Pollius, receives a poem on a villa, this time at Tibur (Tivoli), is Manilius Vopiscus (1.3)[119]. Like Pollius, he combined Epicureanism (91–94) and *quies* (91; cf. 29, 41) with literary production in a variety of poetic genres (23, 99–104); in addition, he was a patron of letters, as Statius explicitly states in the preface to Book 1: "a most learned man, who is foremost in rescuing from decay our almost vanishing literature"[120]. Again like Pollius, he was very rich, owning many villas elsewhere (83–89), and no longer young, if that inference may be drawn from the wish for a long life with which the poem ends (110). But unlike Pollius, he seems not to have been on very familiar terms with Statius, who never calls him *amicus*, *dulcis*, *carus*, or the like, and does not reveal more about him than what has just been enumerated. This makes it difficult to determine his relationship to the two Manilii Vopisci who are known from outside Statius. P. Manilius Vopiscus (*cos.* 114) is honoured in an inscription at Tibur (*ILS* 1044), and he must therefore have inherited the villa described by Statius. He could be the son of Statius' addressee, although Statius does not mention a child. M. Manilius Vopiscus (*suff.* 60) could be the father of Statius' addressee, or even be identical with him; in the latter case it would perhaps be strange that Statius makes no reference at all to his past career. Whatever the precise relationships between these Manilii Vopisci may have been, without doubt we have here a member of a successful senatorial family, who consciously withdrew to a literary life on his villa. Unfortunately we do not know whether he did so *after* a career or *instead of* a career, although the latter seems more likely.

An addressee who is in certain respects comparable to Pollius Felix and Manilius Vopiscus is Atedius Melior, who receives three

---

[119] The exact location of the villa is uncertain: see Cancik 1978: 123–24, criticising Giuliani 1970: 267–87. The identity of Statius' Manilius Vopiscus is discussed by Cancik at 119–20; see further *PIR*^{2} M 140–142, Syme 1982–83: 246–47 = *RP* 4.98–99, 1991b: 465–66.

[120] Cf. Plin. 8.12.1 (of Titinius Capito): *litterarum iam senescentium reductor ac reformator*. This parallel tells against the interpretation of Statius' phrase as referring to the grammatical study of archaic authors (Vollmer 1898: 213 and Frère 1961: 1.12, n. 6*, after W. Ruediger) or to an archaising tendency in Vopiscus' own literary production (Bardon 1956: 231, n. 6, Duret 1986: 3241–42), neither of which are mentioned in Statius' survey of Vopiscus' intellectual activities at 1.3.90–104.

poems in the *Silvae*: 2.1, on the death of Glaucias, a favourite slave boy (but freed at birth[121]), 2.3, on a curiously-shaped tree in the garden of his house, and 2.4, on the death of a parrot. Like Pollius Felix and (probably) Manilius Vopiscus, he was elderly (2.1.70, 2.3.72–74), and like them, he lived the life of a gentleman of leisure, although neither Epicureanism nor poetic activity is attributed to him. Yet he was not indifferent to poetry, as is shown by Statius' compliment to his literary judgement (2.*ep*.2–3), and by the circumstance that he entertained contacts not only with Statius, but also with Martial, who addressed three epigrams to him (6.28–29, 8.38) and mentioned him in two others (2.69, 4.54). Neither poet says anything about a career, and there is no information to be found, either about himself or about his family, in any other source. The only further datum is his devotion to his friend Blaesus (2.1.189–207, 2.3.76–77, Martial 8.38), but this man cannot be certainly identified[122].

Melior's retirement was not as complete as that of Pollius Felix or Manilius Vopiscus. For one thing, Statius and Martial show him not in residence at a villa, but at a city mansion on the Caelius (*Silv.* 2.3.14–16). Moreover, he clearly was something of a public figure: the delights of his table were famous (Mart. 2.69), and he was proverbial for the elegance of his lifestyle (Mart. 4.54.7–8). His young favourite Glaucias, according to Martial, was well-known, and when he died, all Rome mourned his decease (6.28.1–2). Similarly, Statius claims that "all the people" bewailed the sad event, and that the bier was preceded by large crowds (2.1.175–77; cf. 20). This explains Statius' summing up of Melior's existence in the paradoxical address *secrete palam*: "you who live secluded in the public eye" (2.3.69)[123]. Withdrawal from political life did not necessarily entail withdrawal from social life.

---

[121] See Mart. 6.29.3–4; cf. also *libertus* (1) and *patroni* (3) in 6.28. On Statius' treatment of Glaucias' ambiguous position between slave and son see van Dam 1984: 68.

[122] For a hypothesis see p. 314.

[123] On text and interpretation see van Dam 1984: 331–32. Courtney 1990: 48 needlessly supposes the text to be corrupt.

A friend of Melior is Flavius Ursus, who, like him, receives a poem on the death of a favourite slave boy (*Silvae* 2.6)[124]. Unlike Melior, he is still a young man (2.*ep.*19: *iuuenem*), apparently proud of his physique, as Statius includes a few lines in praise of his beauty (2.6.35–37). More important, of course, are his intellectual qualities: in the preface to Book 2 Statius calls him "highly educated" (*doctissimum*), and implies that he spends his leisure in cultural pursuits (2.*ep.*19)[125]. He also seems to act as a barrister, but whether only occasionally (like Septimius Severus) or more regularly (like Vitorius Marcellus) is not indicated (95)[126]. Statius does not mention a political career, and there are no other sources[127]. What Statius does mention, however, is Ursus' wealth: the funeral for the boy has been very lavish (85–93; cf. 2.1.157–65 on Melior), and Ursus owned productive estates in Italy (on four locations), on Crete, and in Libya (60–68). All in all, he seems best characterised as a cultured magnate.

Hardly more than about Flavius Ursus can be known about Novius Vindex, the recipient of *Silvae* 4.6, on a statuette of Hercules, which is also celebrated by Martial (9.43–44)[128]. He wrote poetry (*Silv.* 4.6.30, 98–108; cf. Mart. 9.43.14), and perhaps was a regular patron of literature, if that may be concluded from Statius' words in the preface to Book 4, where he speaks of "the honour which he has deserved for his services to me and to literature as such" (14–15).

---

[124] On the connection between Melior and Ursus, deduced from 2.*ep.*18–22, see below, p. 242.

[125] This must be the meaning of *sine iactura desidiae doctissimum*; see van Dam 1984: 61. But I wonder if Statius could not have written *sine iactantia desidiae doctissimum* (cf. *otium* as object of *iactare* at Sen. *Ep.* 19.2 and 68.5).

[126] *Vbi nota reis facundia raptis?* The expression *reis* ... *raptis* is difficult, and van Dam 1984: 444–45 proposes *aliis* ... *raptis*, which would turn Ursus from a barrister into an author of consolatory literature. This would correspond better with his *desidia* mentioned in the preface (although the combination of *quies* and advocacy would be paralleled by Septimius Severus [*Silv.* 4.5.49–53]).

[127] Frère 1961: 1.54, n. 3* and van Dam 1984: 391 consider relationship with the Ursus who was consul suffect in 84 (D.C. 67.4.2, confirmed by the *Fasti Ostienses*), but that was surely Julius Ursus (*suff.* II 98, *suff.* III 100): cf. Syme 1958: 2.635–36, *PIR*² J 630, Vidman 1982: 77–78.

[128] Balland 1998: 44–46 speculatively proposes that he is a son of the Novius Priscus who was banished in 65 for his friendship with Seneca (Tac. *Ann.* 15.71.3).

Vindex's other hobby was collecting art, preferably works by famous masters (4.6.22–30), which allows of the inference that he was a man of considerable means. Statius' insistence that his meals were not characterised by gastronomical luxury (5–11) carries the same implication. Neither Statius nor Martial gives a hint of a political career (and they are the only sources), but Statius mentions Vindex' devotion to the memory of a friend called Vestinus (93–95). This Vestinus was of aristocratic parentage and had died in the flower of his years, and is therefore probably identical with a Vestinus in Martial (4.73), who, after having bequeathed his large possessions to his friends, believed himself to die an old man (which, accordingly, he was not). If the identity is admitted, Statius' Vestinus would have died in 88, six or seven years before the poems on the statuette. Because aristocratic Vestini are rare, it is virtually certain that Vindex' friend was the son of M. (Julius) Vestinus Atticus (*cos.* 65) and grandson of L. Julius Vestinus, an eminent equestrian who became prefect of Egypt in 59–62 and was put in charge of the reconstruction of the Capitol by Vespasian in 70; we also know of a later member of the family, the learned L. Julius Vestinus, an equestrian who became one of the most important ministers of Hadrian[129]. So Vindex had connections in the highest circles.

There is one more addressee who is praised not for a career, but for wealth and elegance (although not, in this case, for cultural interests): Claudius Etruscus, the recipient of *Silvae* 1.5, on the inauguration of his luxurious baths[130]. The same occasion is celebrated by Martial in an epigram (6.42), but from neither poem could we have gathered that Etruscus' father was an imperial freedman, who had held one of the highest posts at the court, that of the *a rationibus*, responsible for finance. This information is central to another of the *Silvae*, 3.3, on the death of the father, likewise mourned by Martial (7.40). A subsidiary theme in Statius' consolation is the father's return from exile, which is dealt with by Martial in a separate epigram (6.83). *Silvae* 3.3 contains an extensive review of the career of the father, and it will be worth while to include a short summary, both

---

[129] See *PIR*^{2} I 622–24 (Coleman 1988: 192 mistakenly considers the consul to be a brother, rather than a son, of the prefect of Egypt).

[130] The location and nature of these baths will be discussed at p. 311.

for its intrinsic interest and for the light it throws on the background and the position of Claudius Etruscus[131].

The father of Claudius Etruscus died in late 92 at the age of almost ninety (Mart. 7.40.6)[132]: he was therefore born around 3 C.E. His birthplace is specified by Statius as Smyrna (59–62), which implies that he was Greek, like all leading imperial freedmen. As a boy he was brought to the court of Tiberius, from whom he acquired his freedom (66–69). Upon manumission, a slave received the *nomen* of his master, and Tiberius' *nomen*, since his adoption by Augustus in 4 C.E., was "Julius". So the full style of the father of Claudius Etruscus must have been *Tib. Iulius Aug(usti) l(ibertus)*, followed by his original Greek name. Unfortunately, this name is never mentioned by Statius or Martial, but a passing thought may be given to the idea that it was "Phaon", i.e. that the father of Claudius Etruscus was identical with the Phaon epigraphically attested as *a rationibus* (*CIL* 3.14112.2)[133]. If this hypothesis is correct, the persistent motif of "light" in Statius' poem would be explained from his tendency to pun on proper names, "Phaon" being connected with φάος, "light"[134].

---

131 My account in what follows freely draws on Weaver 1972: 284–94 (based on Weaver 1965: 145–54) and Evans 1978, who confirms, corrects, and extends Weaver's reconstruction.

132 Martial's Book 7 was published in December 92; the death cannot have occurred much earlier, because otherwise there would be too long an interval until the composition of *Silvae* 3.3, which presupposes Domitian's refusal of a triumph in January 93 (170–71). The age at death is given by Martial in the words *hic prope ter senas uixit Olympiadas*. The word *Olympias* can mean either a period of four or one of five years; the same holds for *lustrum* as used by Statius (cf. van Dam 1984: 432), who dates the exile to after *dextra bis octonis fluxerunt saecula lustris* (3.3.146). But if we assume that four-year periods are meant in both cases, the father must have been born around 21, which would make him too young to have been manumitted by Tiberius or to have been promoted to senior position by Claudius (see below).

133 The inscription is undated, but may well be Flavian, as shown by Bruun 1989. Bruun also argues that the well-known freedman Phaon who assisted Nero with his suicide (Suet. *Nero* 48–49, D.C. 63.27.3) is a L. Domitius Phaon, freedman of Nero's aunt Domitia Lepida, not to be identified with the *a rationibus* (cf. *PIR*[2] P 340).

134 For Statius' puns on proper names see Nisbet 1978: 8 (and above, p. 230 with n. 111). "Light" in *Silv.* 3.3: 43 (*clara*), 55 (*lucis*), 85 (*lux alta*), 120 (*clarescere*); one might also consider reading *luxerunt* for *fluxerunt* in 146 *dextra bis octonis fluxerunt saecula lustris* (which would well fit *sine nube* in the following line). It may be added that Statius certainly puns on the name of the other great freedman

But it is best to return from speculation to fact, at least as reported by Statius. The father of Claudius Etruscus, after having served Tiberius, accompanied his successor Gaius to Gaul (69–75), and was promoted to senior position by Claudius in the later part of his reign (76–78); because the age for such promotion was around forty-five, this must have occurred around the year 48. Claudius passed him on to Nero (78), but at this point Statius gives no further detail; instead, he introduces some general remarks on the merit of serving many masters, which are an obvious reference to the year of the four emperors (79–85). Under Vespasian he was then appointed to the post of *a rationibus* (85–105), and the same emperor granted him the high honour of admission into the equestrian order (to which his sons already belonged) (138–45). Favour continued unabated until eighty years of his life had passed (146–47), i.e. around 83, when he was banished by Domitian (156–64); the reason may have been a difference of opinion about Domitian's financial policy, especially about his restoration of the coinage in 82[135]. The exile was not a harsh one: he was allowed to reside in Campania and in "the citadels of Diomedes" (*Diomedeas ... arces*: 162), i.e. one of the cities allegedly founded by Diomedes in Southern Italy. Nor was Domitian's anger implacable: the father of Claudius Etruscus was allowed to return (154–55, 164–71; cf. 1.5.65) in 90 or 91[136], but did not long enjoy his return to grace (182–87), dying, as was said above, at the end of 92.

For the understanding of Claudius Etruscus, his father's family life is as important as his career. Fortunately, his marriage can be dated and the identity of his wife deduced. The date is connected with the age of Claudius Etruscus. He is twice called a "young man" (*iuuenis*: 30, 154), but elsewhere he is addressed as "boy" (*puer*: 1.5.64); however, the latter must be an exaggeration, because Statius

---

among his addressees, Abascantus (Ἀ-βάσκαντος), at 5.1.137–49 (overlooked by Nisbet): *Inuidiam, toruo ... lumine, liuentia Fata, maligno, inuidet*. He does not pun on the name of Earinus, the addressee of *Silv*. 3.4, presumably because that had already been done extensively by Martial (9.11–13); cf. Heuvel 1936–37: 324, Henriksén 1998: 107.

[135] Evans 1978: 113, n. 47 noted various areas of possible disagreement over financial policy; Carradice 1979 (cf. 1983: 160–61) made the connection with the restoration of the coinage.

[136] The date is established by Mart. 6.83, on the same occasion.

writes that Etruscus' sorrow for his old father was so great that one could think he mourned a young wife or an adolescent son (8–12), a statement which would be somewhat grotesque if Etruscus were under forty. But it is possible to be more precise. The date of the admission of the father into the equestrian order must be 73–74, during Vespasian's censorship; by that time, the sons were already knights, presumably because of distinguished service in 69–70; because the minimum age for admission to the equestrian order was eighteen years, the elder brother cannot have been born after 51. It is likely that the father only married after his promotion around 48, so that we can date the marriage to around 48–50, and put Etruscus' birthdate around 50[137]. Etruscus was therefore born under Claudius, and apparently his parents gave him the *nomen* of the reigning emperor[138].

The reason not to assume a marriage date before the promotion is that the wife can be identified as coming from an ambitious equestrian family on the rise. Statius says that her brother was a consular, who had defeated the Dacians and thereby allowed Domitian to celebrate his triumph in 89 (115–118). This must be L. Tettius Julianus (*suff.* 83), to whom Dio Cassius (67.10.1–2) attributes the decisive victory over the Dacians at Tapae in 88. The hypothesis is confirmed by the occurrence of a Tettius Etruscus (perhaps the same man: Tettius Julianus Etruscus) on the famous inscription (dating from 101) about an alimentary scheme at Ligures Baebiani (*ILS* 6509). Moreover, we recall that the father of Claudius Etruscus spent his exile in a city said to be founded by Diomedes, and Ligures Baebiani is adjacent to two such cities: Beneventum and Aequum Tuticum (Serv. on *A.* 8.9)[139]. Obviously the father of Claudius Etruscus retired to estates belonging to his wife's family.

His wife herself can hardly have been senatorial like her brother, because marriages between freedmen and senatorial women were prohibited by law (and dispensations almost never granted), so that

---

[137] See Weaver 1965: 150–52 = 1972: 289–92 and Evans 1978: 107–09 for more detail. The elder brother was clearly Etruscus himself: cf. 3.3.152–53 with 5.2.75.

[138] This is the suggestion of Evans 1978: 107, n. 19, who rightly rejects Weaver's hypothesis (1965: 153 = 1972: 293) that Etruscus' mother belonged to the *gens Claudia*.

[139] Noted by Champlin 1981: 259, with n. 50.

we have to assume that Tettius Julianus rose from the equestrian order. This assumption is supported by the existence of an equestrian careerist C. Tettius Africanus Cassianus Priscus, who became prefect of Egypt in 80–82; he was the son-in-law of another high personage, the consular L. Funisolanus Vettonius (*suff.* 78)[140]. It has been persuasively argued that the progress of all these people benefited from the influence at court of their freedman relative, and, conversely, that the latter's return from exile was not unconnected with the high standing of Tettius Julianus after the victory over the Dacians.

Statius and Martial try to give a different impression: they suggest that Domitian's change of mind was due to the intervention of Claudius Etruscus himself (*Silv.* 3.3.183–84, Mart. 6.83.1–2). But this is little more than a compliment to the filial devotion of their addressee. Another claim, however, made by Martial (8) if not by Statius, will indeed be true, that Claudius Etruscus accompanied his father into exile. Because the banishment occurred when Etruscus was in his early thirties and lasted some seven years, this will have put an effective stop to his career, if he had embarked on one at all. So it is no wonder that the poems on his baths stress his wealth (which certainly derived from his father's; cf. *Silv.* 3.3.147–50).

The other head of a Palatine department honoured in the *Silvae* is T. Flavius Abascantus, the addressee of 5.1: although he was still a *iuuenis* (11, 76, 197, 247), he had already become *ab epistulis*, i.e. chief official in charge of the imperial correspondence[141]. Like the father of Claudius Etruscus, Abascantus married a woman of good birth (53), presumably equestrian. Her name, Priscilla, does not allow of any further identification, but apparently she had connections at court, perhaps through her first marriage (45–46): she personally begged Domitian for the appointment of her husband (at least this is what Statius' language suggests: 71–74), and in any case she personally thanked him (111–13). Her death is the occasion of Statius' poem. As in the poem to Claudius Etruscus (3.3.33–37), Statius stresses the luxury of the funeral ceremony (208–16), but here he has

---

[140] For this and for the theory that follows see Evans 1978.

[141] He is also known epigraphically: *CIL* 6.8598–99 (both giving the title *ab epistulis*), 2214, and probably 8713 (cf. n. 142). On his career see Weaver 1994, who, argues that in spite of Statius' language, Abascantus must have been nearer 50 than 40 (344–51).

a further manifestation of devotion and of wealth to report: Priscilla's corpse was not burnt (as was still usual), but embalmed, and placed in a grave monument having the shape of a temple, decorated with sculptures which represented the deceased in the guise of various goddesses (222–46)[142]. This shows not only that a freedman like Abascantus was very wealthy, but also that his life was highly public; the latter aspect is underlined by Statius when he says that "the eyes of great Rome" (217) pitied him during the funeral ceremony. Moreover, to document Priscilla's love of the imperial house, Abascantus erected on the Capitol a golden statue of the Emperor weighing a hundred pounds (188–91), of which the costs have been estimated at 6,000,000 sesterces[143]. So this poem, like that on the father of Claudius Etruscus, provides abundant evidence that the highest imperial freedmen were recognised public figures, commanding not only great political, but also great material resources.

The third imperial freedman in the *Silvae* is of a quite different calibre: this is T. Flavius Earinus, the addressee of *Silvae* 3.4, who had been brought to the court at Rome from Pergamum when still a child (12–59), had been castrated before Domitian forbade that practice (65–77), and had been become Domitian's darling[144]. Statius' poem commemorates the first cutting of his hair (which signified the transition to adulthood), an occasion likewise honoured by Martial (9.11–13, 16–17, 36). Even if this strikes a rather more frivolous chord than the laborious careers of the father of Claudius Etruscus and of Abascantus, Earinus' wealth and influence should not be underestimated. He was rich enough to send his locks to the temple of Aesculapius in his native Pergamum in a gold casket beset with jewels, together with a mirror from the same materials (3.*ep.*18–19, 3.4.2, 91, 94); moreover, the spectacular rise in importance of the Pergamene sanctuary of Aesculapius precisely from Domitian's time onwards has been plausibly connected with the interest taken by

---

[142] *CIL* 6.2214 and probably 8713 are connected with this monument; cf. Frère 1961: 2.173, n. 2*, 183, n. 1*. It is usually identified with the tomb opposite the church *Domine quo vadis*; cf. Wrede 1981: 75, n. 81 (with literature), Coarelli 1993: 15–16. For further discussion see p. 302.

[143] See Mratschek-Halfmann 1993: 344.

[144] The life of Earinus is discussed by Henriksén 1997. See further p. 427.

Earinus[145]. In his case, too, the condition of asymmetry is fulfilled, just as we saw it to be fulfilled for all other addressees, whether senatorial careerists, equestrians ambitious for their offspring, wealthy gentlemen of leisure, or freedmen heads of the great Palatine bureaux.

Duration

Only three of Statius' addressees are honoured with more than one poem in the *Silvae*: Pollius Felix (2.2 and 3.1), Atedius Melior (2.1, 3, and 4), and Claudius Etruscus (1.5 and 3.3); outside the *Silvae*, Statius had earlier published a letter to Vibius Maximus (4.*ep.*15–18), and he promises to offer a "composition more worthy of him" to Plotius Grypus (4.*ep.*22–23). So in these cases we have duration in a literal sense. But, as has been explained in the Introduction, the importance of duration lies in its being a corollary of the personal nature of the relationship. Now the personal nature of the ties attaching Statius to his addressees is essential to the kind of poetry he writes in the *Silvae*, because all poems in the collection are conceived as communications within a personal relationship. Statius talks as guest to host, he consoles or congratulates, and writes letters in an affectionate or a joking spirit. All such communications can only succeed if there is some measure of familiarity between both partners; otherwise, the communication miscarries: if one attempts, for instance, to console a person whom one hardly knows, one will appear impertinent or calculating or both[146]. Statius needs to put it beyond doubt that he, of course, does meet all the requirements for the communications he undertakes, and this is why he usually specifies the personal nature of his relationship with his addressee in the poem itself or (for the benefit of secondary audiences) in the preface to the published book. But the amount of familiarity and affection that Statius can credibly advertise differs considerably from addressee to addressee, as I will now show in a survey of the individual addressees (whom I will take in the same order as in the section on asymmetry).

---

[145] See Habicht 1969: 7–8.

[146] This part of the solution of how to praise persons of higher standing than oneself. Another part is the use of mythological spokespersons: see Coleman 1999.

In the poem on the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus, the Prefect of the City (1.4), Statius claims that during Gallicus' illness he has haunted the doors of the latter's house by day and by night, full of concern and anxious expectation:

> quis omni
> luce mihi, quis nocte timor, dum postibus haerens
> adsiduus nunc aure uigil, nunc lumine cuncta
> aucupor (117–20)

> what fear I had every day, every night, when clinging to the doorway I kept unremitting watch, and now with ear, then with eye, scrutinised everything for signs.

Statius calls the gods and the stars to witness (116–17), and indeed, others will have hardly been in a position to verify his claim. A suspicion lingers that Statius had not been very close to Gallicus before, and takes advantage of an opportunity to recommend himself to the attention of this very senior personage, whose poetic abilities he duly flatters (19–37).

A similar suspicion can be entertained with respect to Arruntius Stella, the addressee of *Silvae* 1.2. Statius addresses him as "dearest" (*carissime*: 1.*ep.*20), but when he has to explain what personal cause he has to write an epithalamium, his formulations remain rather non-committal. He is moved "not by one love or a single cause for song" (*non unus amor simplexque canendi/ causa*: 256–57): the bride is a compatriot (260–65), and the groom a fellow-poet:

> tecum similes iunctaeque Camenae,
> Stella, mihi, multumque pares bacchamur ad aras
> et sociam doctis haurimus ab amnibus undam (257–59)

> with you I share similar and related Muses, Stella, and often we revel at equal altars and draw allied water from the streams of poetry.

The wording suggests closeness, perhaps even performance on the same occasions, but on more sober inspection the lines say nothing more than that the poetry written by both is in some way similar; because Stella's love elegies had in fact little in common with Statius' *Silvae* or *Thebaid*, the reference must merely be to the metrical connection between the elegiac distich (written by Stella) and the

hexameter (written by Statius)[147]. So perhaps Statius was much less close to Stella than his colleague Martial.

To Maecius Celer, on the other hand, Statius seems to have been bound by true friendship. It is true that the poem he writes for Celer (3.2) is a *propempticon* (farewell poem), and that the assertion of friendship is a *topos* (conventional element) in that kind of poem: Statius is not original to write: "you are part of my soul" (7–8), "I was the last to leave the ship" (51–60), "I wish seafaring had never been invented" (61–77), "I am concerned for your safety" (78–89), "I wish I could have accompanied you" (90–100), or "I will be the first to be greeted when you return home" (131–35)[148]. But a *topos* can only be used when it is in itself credible, and Statius adds an individual note by imagining that Celer, upon his return, will inquire after the *Thebaid* (142–43). Moreover, in the preface to Book 3 he introduces Celer as "a young man in whom I take great pleasure" (*mihi iucundissimum iuuenem*: 3.*ep.*11–12).

Vitorius Marcellus is addressed at the beginning of the preface to Book 4 as *carissime*, and it is implied that he has shown *pietas* to Statius (4.*ep.*1)[149]. That these are no empty flourishes is shown by the poem which Statius addresses to him (4.4), a chatty letter in the Horatian manner, in which friendship is a major theme (cf. 101–05). So it is fitting that Statius brings in Marcellus' best friend, Gallus (20–23), and imagines that whenever Gallus talks with Marcellus, he himself is never far from their conversation (23–25). And it is also fitting that Statius imagines Marcellus as interested in his poetry, and asks him for advice on what new epic to undertake after the completion of the *Thebaid* (87–100).

The poem to Crispinus (5.2) is a modification of the *propempticon*, and just as in the poem to Maecius Celer, Statius stresses his

---

[147] Cf. 8–9, 250–51.I cannot believe that Statius wants to say that the *contents* of the *Silvae* are similar to those of elegy (as Vollmer 1898: 25, 260–61, after F. Leo), or that the *Silvae* and elegy both belong to the category of "light poetry" (as Aricò 1965, followed by Duret 1986: 3239).

[148] See Cairns 1972 *passim* (cf. "General Index" s.vv. "propemptikon", "Statius *Siluae* 3 2"), Hardie 1983: 156–64, and Laguna 1992: 191–239.

[149] White 1973b: 279–82 argues that Statius means that Marcellus had shown *pietas* towards the emperor. See further the discussion of this passage at p. 286.

emotions on the departure of his friend (1–14), and mentions the latter's interest in his poetry (160–63).

As for Plotius Grypus, the joking character of the piece addressed to him (4.9; 4.*ep.*24) does not allow of sentimental assertions of friendship, but gift-giving on the Saturnalia (the background to the poem) and the act of joking itself are evidence of a familiar relationship.

Turning to Septimius Severus, we find the by now familiar pattern: Statius mentions their friendship both in the preface to the book (4.*ep.*12–13) and in the poem itself (4.5.25) and describes the interest of his addressee in his poetry (4.5.25–30).

It is similar with Vibius Maximus: Statius asserts that Maximus is "being loved" by him (*diligi*: 4.*ep.*17), and he mentions his help with the *Thebaid* (4.*ep.*15–18, 4.7.25–28), and hopes for his support for the *Achilleid* (4.7.21–24).

In the poem for Julius Menecrates (4.8), literary activities are not at issue, but Statius allows himself to complain and rebuke, not, of course, because there was no friendship, but because there was: "I am even angry, with the anger of those who love" (*irascorque etiam, quantum irascuntur amantes*: 33)[150].

With Pollius Felix, we come to the addressee who offers the most abundant evidence on duration. In the preface to Book 2 "my friend Pollius" (*Pollius meus*) is presented as an indulgent *amicus* (2.*ep.*12–14); in the preface to book 3 (which is dedicated to him) he is addressed as "sweetest" (*dulcissime*: 3.*ep.*1) and described as a companion and guide in literary activities (1–6) and as Statius' real destination upon his proposed retirement to Campania (23–25); in the preface to Book 4 (which contains the poem on his son-in-law Julius Menecrates) he is again referred to as *Pollius meus* (4.*ep.*20). The poems themselves, the descriptions of the villa (2.2) and of the temple of Hercules (3.1), are written from the perspective of a guest (cf. 2.2.6–12, 3.1.61–67), and the mere fact that the poems are a year apart in date shows that Pollius' hospitality was not extended to Statius on one single occasion only. Statius himself confirms that he

150 Cf. further Vessey 1974: 264–65. See also below, p. 246.

stayed at Surrentum *non hospes* (3.1.65), which means "not as a stranger"[151].

If Argentaria Polla, the addressee of *Silvae* 2.7, is the same as Polla, the wife of Pollius, then duration is established at one stroke. If not, we have no evidence[152], but we should note that, Polla being a woman, Statius could not decently stress familiarity or affection.

Manilius Vopiscus, like Pollius Felix, received a description of a villa (1.3), but although this poem is likewise written from the perspective of a guest, it contains no further signs of a personal relationship, and its mechanical raptures sharply contrast with the human warmth of the praise of Pollius[153]. The only uncertain indication of duration is Statius' claim in the preface to Book 1 that Vopiscus "uses to boast" (1.*ep*.25–26) that the description was written in a single day, which suggests at least some degree of ongoing contact.

Atedius Melior, although present in one book only, stands with Pollius Felix in terms of duration. The preface to that book, the second, opens with the statement that Statius is happy about the *familiaritas* he enjoys with Melior (2.*ep*.1), goes on to imply that he had been a frequent guest at his house (5–7)[154], and at the end returns to Melior, addressing him as *carissime* (27). The three poems for Melior all confirm this picture: a consolation on the death of a boy (2.1), whom Statius had obviously known well and calls *noster* ("our dear") in the preface (2.*ep*.5); a mythological fancy on a tree in Melior's garden (2.3), offered as a birthday gift (62–63); and another consolation, this time a more playful one, on the death of a pet (2.4), where the gentle mockery indicates real closeness.

Flavius Ursus was a friend of Melior, but also of Statius, being called *noster* (2.*ep*.18), "our mutual friend"[155]. In the consolation on the loss of a young favourite (2.6), Statius emphasises that he himself has been witness to the extraordinary qualities of the boy (21, 30), thus demonstrating his familiarity with Ursus and his right to console him.

---

[151] Cf. Mart. 3.5.3, 12.2 (3).5.

[152] The preface to Book 2 (2.*ep*.22–26) allows of no inference, whatever emendation is chosen for the corrupt *consuleremus* (24).

[153] This is well brought out by Cancik 1978: 127–28.

[154] So much is clear, although the text is corrupt.

[155] On this meaning of *noster* see pp. 242–243.

Novius Vindex is likewise called *noster* (4.*ep.* 13), this time as a mutual friend of Statius and Marcellus. At the dinner table where Statius had seen the statuette which is the theme of his poem (4.6), "true love" (*uerus amor*: 12) had reigned, which suggests (even if it does not prove) that Statius had known Vindex beforehand.

We are on firmer ground with Claudius Etruscus, the "beloved comrade" (*dilecto ... sodali*: 1.5.9), at whose dinner-table (1.*ep.*30) Statius composed a poem on his baths in 90 or 91 (1.5), and to whom he was still close enough at the beginning of 93 to console him on the death of his father, the great imperial freedman (3.3).

To the other great imperial freedman, Abascantus, recipient of *Silvae* 5.1, Statius was linked by *amicitia*, and more in particular by the friendship between their wives, as appears from the covering letter (5.1.*ep.*), discussed at the beginning of this chapter.

Only in the case of the third imperial freedman, the favourite Earinus, is there no evidence on duration. But, as was remarked in the section on asymmetry, the relationship with him cannot be separated from that with the emperor Domitian, which will have to be treated in Part III.

Apart from this borderline case, duration is always present, even if not always strongly or clearly. These variations will have to be taken into account in Chapter 6, on the functions of Statius' poetry for his patrons, but in the present chapter we still need to establish whether his addressees may indeed be called "patrons". For that to be the case, the third criterion, after asymmetry and duration, needs also to be met.

Reciprocity

Quite unlike Martial, Statius hardly ever talks about the material aspects of his exchanges with his addressees. The major exception occurs, significantly enough, in poem 4.9, which attempts to emulate Martial's manner, and which is written on that favourite occasion for Martial's jokes on reciprocity, the Saturnalia. Statius jestingly complains that for the *libellus* ("little book") he had sent as a present to Plotius Grypus, he has received only another *libellus* in return: he is prepared to take this as a Saturnalian joke, but only if Grypus sends something else in addition; otherwise Grypus' fun will no longer be funny (1–6). Statius then mockingly compares the two gifts: he him-

self sent a roll produced by his own slaves and containing poetry of his own (7–9)[156], Grypus a volume with speeches by someone else, bought at a bookseller's (10–23). Any other Saturnalian gift , Statius pretends, would have been more valuable (23–45). But more importantly, he reminds Grypus that the observance of strict symmetry in gift-exchange is not appropriate in view of the asymmetry of their respective resources and social position (46–52). Therefore Statius ends his poem with expressing the hope that Grypus will not reward it with ... a poem (53–55). We see that at the Saturnalia, which allowed of playful commentary on asymmetry and exchange, Statius openly articulates that he expects a material reward for his poetry. But normally, he is reticent, in accordance with the greater seriousness and dignity of his poetry in comparison with Martial's.

However, in a few passages in the prefaces to the published books, Statius uses the terminology of debt and credit in which the Romans were wont to couch their conceptions of reciprocity (as was shown in the Introduction[157]). Thus, when Statius explains why he has composed the *Genethliacon Lucani* (2.7), he writes as follows:

> Cludit uolumen genethliacon Lucani, quod Polla Argentaria, rarissima uxorum, cum hunc diem forte †consuleremus†, imputari sibi uoluit. (2.*ep*.22–24)
>
> The volume closes with the birthday poem for Lucan, which Argentaria Polla, rarest of wives, happened to request for her account, when we were celebrating this anniversary[158].

Imputare is a term of accountancy, meaning "to enter into the account", either in the sense of "to debit" or in that of "to credit"; the former meaning is the normal one, and it is the only one when the word is used in the context of *beneficia* and *gratia* within a relationship of *amicitia*[159]. Such a context is obviously to be assumed for our

---

[156] *Praeter me* (9) implies that Statius had composed the text of the *libellus*, not that it was an autograph copy, which would be highly unusual (cf. p. 130 with n. 127) and which is nowhere implied in the passages adduced by Coleman 1988: 224 (on 1–2).

[157] See pp. 24–25.

[158] For the corrupt *consuleremus* I translate F. Skutsch's emendation *coleremus* (cf. White 1975: 281–83), but the reading does not affect my argument.

[159] Neither from the article in *ThLL* nor from that in *OLD* can this be easily perceived, but cf. e.g. Juv. 5.14 (quoted at p. 17) and the way the word is used in Se-

passage, so that the text effectively says: "Argentaria Polla wished the poem to be charged to her account"[160]. So an obligation to reciprocate is implied.

The two other instances of financial imagery are somewhat more complex, because they involve more than one addressee. The first passage immediately precedes the one just quoted:

> Ad Vrsum quoque nostrum ... scriptam ... consolationem super ea quae ipsi debeo huic libro libenter inserui, quia honorem eius tibi laturus accepto est. (2.*ep.*18–22)

> As for the consolation for our friend Ursus, I was happy to include it in this book, not only because of what I owe him himself, but also because he will credit the honour to you.

This is to say that Statius "owed" something to Ursus (which implies that Ursus had been generous in some way), and paid his debt by publishing the poem; moreover, by including the poem in a book dedicated to Melior, Statius put Ursus in Melior's debt: Ursus would "credit"[161] Melior with it, and this meant that Statius rendered a service not only to Ursus, but also to Melior. This is not difficult to understand in itself, but there are of course numerous other instances of a poem addressed to X being included in a book dedicated to Y, and in all those cases there is no reference to X being indebted to Y. The clue must lie in *noster* (18), which here obviously does not mean "my friend" (as would be possible in itself), but "our friend": Ursus was not only a friend of Statius, but also of Melior. Perhaps Melior had requested Statius to include the poem for Ursus, or perhaps he had even commissioned it to begin with. Statius does not give sufficient information to reconstruct the background in detail, but whatever the exact relations between Melior, Ursus and Statius may have

---

neca's *De Beneficiis*: 1.4.3, 1.14.1, 2.15.2, 3.18.1, 3.31.4, 5.18.2, 6.12.1, 6.13.5; further passages cited *OLD* s.v. *imputo* 3a.

[160] *ThLL* 7.730.58–70 lists our passage (and 4.*ep.*15, discussed below) under "i.q. donare, dedicare", together with Mart. 3.6.3, 4.82.2, 5.20.13, 5.80.2, 10.30.26, 12.48.13, 12.82.2, but in each of these passages the meaning "to charge" is clearly present (as is well brought out in the translations of Shackleton Bailey 1993). *OLD* lists our passage (and 4.*ep.*15) under "to lay (to the credit of)" s.v. *imputo* 2b, rather than under "to make (a favour) a cause of obligation (to)" s.v. *imputo* 3a. The note in van Dam 1984: 62 is also inaccurate.

[161] On the meaning of *accepto ferre* see *ThLL* 1.321.82–322.7

been, it is clear that the poetry Statius wrote was an item in the accounts they mentally kept.

A very similar context is to be found in the preface to the fourth book, addressed to Vitorius Marcellus:

> Vindicis nostri Herculem Epitrapezion secundum honorem quem de me et de ipsis studiis meretur imputare etiam tibi possum. (4.*ep.*13–15)
>
> As for the Hercules Epitrapezios of our friend Vindex: because of the honour which he has deserved for his services to me and to literature as such, I can charge his poem to you as well.

Here Statius is not concerned with the dedicatee's credit with the poem's addressee, but with his own credit with the dedicatee. Again, Statius' utterance is somewhat enigmatic, but one may nevertheless try to spell out the underlying assumptions. If Marcellus can be charged for a poem addressed to Vindex, then presumably because that poem enhances the value of the book addressed to Marcellus, in which it is included. If, secondly, Marcellus agrees to be charged in Vindex' name, then, apparently, because he is a friend of Vindex (*noster* again), and as such has no objections to supporting the same causes as Vindex supports: Statius and literature. This interpretation must remain doubtful, and it may be that Statius' mental picture of the obligations between himself, Marcellus, and Vindex was different from the one here tentatively sketched. But the decisive point is that he *had* such a mental picture: it is *not* doubtful that the passage contains an account of debt and credit, and that Statius' poems were accepted as currency.

Although Statius uses the vocabulary of accountancy only three times (once perhaps prompted by the name Argentaria[162], twice to deal with the relationship between the addressee of the poem and the dedicatee of the book), we may hazard the hypothesis that he and his addressees *always* thought in these terms, and acted accordingly. The pattern of the *amicitia* between Statius and his addressees will not have been fundamentally different from the pattern of *amicitia* generally, which, as we have seen in the Introduction, was characterised by reciprocity. Because it has been demonstrated in the present chapter that the *amicitia* between Statius and his addressees was also

---

[162] On the probable pun on the name "Argentaria" see above, p. 224 with n. 112.

asymmetrical and of some duration (i.e. of a personal nature), we may henceforth call it "patronage".

Initiative

One of the characteristic features of patronage is that both patron and client have the freedom to initiate a transaction; for literary patronage this means that a poet may work on order, but does not need to do so[163]. Accordingly, we would expect to find in the *Silvae* cases both of poet's and of patron's initiative; the following few pages, the last of this chapter, will test that expectation. The inquiry will be hampered by the scarcity of information to be drawn from the *Silvae*: only in a handful of cases does Statius state or suggest whose was the initiative, his own or the patron's[164].

To begin with indications of poet's initiative. We find a rather vague hint in the poem to Rutilius Gallicus, where the great politician, who is also presented as a great poet, is bidden not to spurn being honoured by "a humbler lyre", as Statius modestly calls his own (1.4.34–36). An indication of a different type is to be found in the poem on Atedius Melior's tree, of which Statius says that it is offered as a birthday gift (2.3.62–63). Then there are some assertions of spontaneity, such as the claim that Statius hymned Pollius' temple to Hercules as soon as he saw it (3.*ep*.9–10), or the explanation that he sent Maecius Celer on his way with a poem because he could not accompany him in reality (3.*ep*.11–14). Similarly, Statius says that he has had to apologise to Melior for his rashness in offering a consolation on the death of the boy Glaucias (2.*ep*.7–9). In another consolation, that to Claudius Etruscus, he claims that he will make a poetic offering to Etruscus' dead father of his own account (*ultro*: 3.3.32–33)[165], and explains that he is motivated by his experience in mourning his own father (39–42). When later in the same poem he

[163] Cf. Introduction. p. 28.

[164] It is not true that "Statius reveals an overt and consistent concern with ... the matter of who took the initiative" (Hardie 1983: 144).

[165] But *ultro* does not necessarily carry that meaning: it was translated by Frère-Izaac 1961: 1.113 as "pour ma part" (corresponding to Etruscus' moans) and by Laguna 1992: 83 as "incluso" (in addition to a non-poetic consolation).

says that Etruscus' devotion "demands" (*poscit*) poetry from him (173–74), this is probably best taken as a variant on the very similar statement in the preface that Etruscus' devotion "merited" (*merebatur*) a poem (3.*ep.*14–15), and not as evidence for initiative from Etruscus.

Unambiguous statements on patron's initiative occur only in three cases. Statius says that Arruntius Stella had "commanded" (*iniunxeras*) his epithalamium (1.*ep.*21), that Argentaria Polla "wanted" (*uoluit*) to be charged for the poem on Lucan (2.*ep.*24), and that Earinus had "asked" (*petisset*) for a poetic dedication of his hair (3.*ep.*18). It is perhaps no accident that all three poems were written for rather formal, ceremonial occasions (which were also celebrated by Martial), and that for all three addressees the evidence for duration is tenuous (Stella), equivocal (Polla), or absent (Earinus). So there was perhaps less reason than usual to present the poem as a spontaneous effusion.

This leads to an important question: under what circumstances will patron's initiative be advertised by the poet, and under what circumstances will it be hushed up? It has recently been argued that there are many grounds why a poet might want to be explicit about a patron's request and even to exaggerate the amount of pressure put upon him: by so doing he gives publicity to his connection with the patron, he documents the value the patron sets upon his work, and he strengthens his claims on the patron's gratitude and support[166]. But this holds true only for "neutral" works, such as epics or didactic treatises: when the poetry presents itself as a personal communication to the patron, a congratulation, a consolation, or a farewell, its credibility will suffer when it is known to have been written to order. Moreover, when this communication is in an admiratory and laudative vein, as is universally the case in Statius, then there is a second reason why frankness about patron's initiative could be counterproductive: if one openly admits that one praises on request, one's praise may become less convincing. So we may suspect that there are more instances of patron's initiative in the *Silvae* than are explicitly acknowledged by Statius.

[166] See White 1993: 64–71.

This suspicion is confirmed by a revealing passage in the poem to Julius Menecrates (4.8), where Statius is moved to articulate his expectations on initiative precisely because they have been violated. After congratulating Menecrates on the birth of his third child, Statius complains that he has had to hear the good news by common report and had not received a *littera, quae ... iuberet ... cantu signare diem*, "a letter which ... ordered me ... to mark the day with song" (38–40)[167]: now the congratulation has to be late, and therefore less convincing. The passage demonstrates that poet's initiative was allowed, but that patron's initiative was expected. The "normal" situation can be deduced from the poem immediately preceding (4.7): there Statius expresses his eagerness for the return of Vibius Maximus from Dalmatia, but forgives him his loitering, because a child has been born to him there. So in this case a letter which bade Statius to mark the day with song *had* arrived, although this is never mentioned in the poem itself. The explicitness in the poem to Julius Menecrates is connected with the breach of the pattern: perhaps Statius even needed to justify to Menecrates why he had taken the initiative himself.

Other signs of patron's initiative are less conclusive. Thus the detailed knowledge that Statius displays of the career of his addressees (in so far as they had one) is certainly evidence for guidance, but not necessarily for commission. We may compare the dedication of a statue: the initiative was the client's, but he had to consult his patron on what exactly should be included in the inscription.

The same distinction between commission and guidance needs to be observed in dealing with the correspondences between Statius and Martial when they write on the same occasion. These correspondences can hardly be explained differently than from information provided by the patron[168]. One may add that even the notorious single instance of a glaring discrepancy between the two poets can be accounted for in this way. In describing the baths of Claudius Etruscus, Martial's enthusiastic enumeration of the precious marbles used in

---

[167] Coleman 1988: 46 (cf. 216) prints Bentley's conjecture *creta* for *cantu*, but *creta* is impossible and *cantu* certainly sound: see Corti 1991b: 130–32, van Dam 1992: 220–21.

[168] See White 1975, Hardie 1983: 70–71.

the building includes *onyx* (alabaster) and *ophites* (serpentine) (6.42.14–15), whereas Statius, illustrating the fastidiousness of Etruscus' taste, asserts that *onyx* and *ophites* have *not* been used (1.5.35). The mistake is clearly Martial's, and the easiest explanation is that he has simply not paid enough attention to Etruscus' commentary[169]. Interestingly enough, the epigram features a fictional "Oppianus", who is presented as being bored by Martial's long disquisition, and perhaps this is meant as a gentle mockery of Etruscus. However that may have been, there is still no evidence for explicit commission. But explicit commission will not even have been necessary, because the code of patronage demanded that the poets made a return for the hospitality or other favours that they received from their patron. And observation of the host will have sufficed to teach what precise return would be welcome.

For a final look at initiative and patronage I will return to the passage with which I began this chapter: Statius' note to Abascantus (5.1.*ep.*), accompanying the consolation on the death of his wife Priscilla (5.1). Statius does not specify whose was the initiative for the consolation, and at first sight it would seem to be his own: for normally one does not console on order. But at the beginning of the poem Statius has to explain why he has waited a full year since Priscilla has died (5.1.16–17). Of course, he gives good philosophical reasons for his delay: Abascantus has been too grief-stricken to be receptive to soothing words (18–29), and even now the wound still smarts (30–31). But this is no more than a conventional rationalisation: when Statius wished to justify an immediate reaction he was perfectly capable of appealing to a different set of motifs[170]. Moreover, Statius was eager for Abascantus' *amicitia* (5.1*ep.*10–12), and would probably have reacted sooner, if he had dared to. So we may surmise that he had received an order from Abascantus. It is hardly credible that this happened because Abascantus after a year suddenly felt the wish to be consoled, and it is much more likely that he had some axe to grind. This is a suspicion which will have to be

[169] It is generally recognised that Statius corrects Martial's mistake: see e.g. Grewing 1997: 294–95, 300, Henriksén 1998: 94–96, Busch 1999: 54–57.

[170] At 2.*ep.*7–12 (partly quoted above) Statius gives as his excuse for having offered 2.1 *festinanter* that *paene superuacua sint tarda solacia*. On both *topoi*, that of late and that of early consolation, see van Dam 1984: 74–75.

investigated in Chapter 6; at the moment we may note that a relationship of literary patronage not only entailed that poet's initiative was allowed, but even that it could be suggested when the initiative was in fact the patron's. The institution of literary patronage made it possible to pass off a commissioned text as an unsolicited tribute by a devoted dependent, and thus to promote the fiction of the poet's spontaneity and concomitant sincerity.

CHAPTER FIVE

MODES OF RECEPTION OF STATIUS' *SILVAE*

On the very threshold of the *Silvae*, Statius explains to Stella (and through him to the readers) why he has chosen to publish the collection at all. The passage needs to be quoted at some length:

> Diu multumque dubitaui, Stella ..., an hos libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi uoluptate fluxerunt, cum singuli de sinu meo pro***, congregatos ipse dimitterem. Quid enim *** quoque auctoritate editionis onerari, qui adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo? ... Quid quod et serum erat continere, cum illa uos certe quorum honori data sunt, haberetis? Sed apud ceteros necesse est multum illis pereat ex uenia, cum amiserint quam solam habuerunt gratiam celeritatis. Nullum enim ex illis biduo longius tractum, quaedam et in singulis diebus effusa. (1.*ep.*1–14)
>
> For a long time I have seriously hesitated, Stella, ..., what to do with these small texts, which flowed from me in the heat of the moment and with a kind of delight in rushing: now that individually they have escaped from my shelter, should I bring them out myself in collected form? For why should I burden myself with the responsibility for yet another publication, anxious as I still am for my *Thebaid*, although it has left my hands? ... And another reason [scil. for publishing]: it would be too late to hold them back, now that they are already in the possession of yourself and others in whose honour they were written. Yet, with everybody else they will necessarily forfeit much of their claim to indulgence, because they have lost the only appeal they had: the appeal of swift composition. For none of them has been worked at for longer than two days, and some have even been turned out in a single day.[1]

The poems were originally given to their respective addressees (11)[2], and subsequent publication in book form was not envisaged (or so

---

[1] In the first lacuna I translate (e.g.) *pro<diissent>* (Itali), in the second *<oportet me huius>* with the subsequent change of *quo* to *qui* (Baehrens, partly following Domitius). See further below, p. 281 with n. 88.

[2] The expression *honori dare* (not in *ThLL* or *OLD*) means "to honour": cf. H. Heubner on Tac. *Hist.* 1.77.2, who cites Laurea 7–8 (Courtney 1993: 182; *FPL*^{3} 184), Sen. *Ben.* 6.18.1, Tac. *Ann.* 2.58.1, 3.72.4, 13.49.4, 14.4.3, 14.14.1. The no-

Statius implies); when the decision to publish was eventually taken, some apology seemed in order. Yet Statius did not convince everybody, for in the preface to the fourth book he had to defend himself against those "who censure, as I hear, that I have published this kind of writing (4.*ep*.26–27). One may ask what kind of poetry exactly is envisaged in "this kind of writing" (*hoc stili genus*), and the answer seems to be provided by Statius in the passage quoted above, because he there stresses one single characteristic of the poetry he has decided to publish: the great speed at which it was composed. The rest of the preface to Book 1 (as far as it has been preserved: the end is lost) specifies for each individual poem in the book why Statius' claim of rapid composition should be believed by his readers.

The claim recurs in the prefaces to Books 2 and 3. The main theme of the preface to Book 2 is that the entire book in some way regards Melior (2.*ep*.3–4), but Statius also finds the opportunity to remark that the consolation on the death of Melior's young freedman Glaucias had been written "in a rush" (*festinanter*: 8), that the villa of Pollius Felix "should have been described more diligently" (*debuit ... diligentius dici*: 13–14), and that the short poem on a tamed lion accidentally slain in the amphitheatre had been offered to the emperor "at once" (*statim*: 18). In the preface to Book 3 Statius asserts that he produced his poem on the temple of Hercules "as soon as I had seen it" (*statim ut uideram*: 10), and that Earinus had not needed to wait long for a poetic dedication of his locks (17)[3].

At the beginning of the preface to Book 3 Statius addresses Pollius:

> Tibi certe ... non habeo diu probandam libellorum istorum temeritatem, cum scias multos ex illis in sinu tuo subito natos et hanc audaciam stili nostri frequenter expaueris (3.*ep*.1–4)

> To you, in any case, ... I do not need to justify at length the recklessness of these small texts, because you know that many of them came suddenly to birth under your shelter, and the audacity of my manner of writing has often caused you alarm.

---

tion of giving is not necessarily present, but in our text it is contained in *haberetis* (1.*ep*.11).

[3] "*Quamdiu*, id est, *Quam non diu*": Markland 1827: 255.

The connotations of the vocabulary used by Statius can be elicited by a comparison with a passage from Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, in which the topic is the "delight" (*uoluptas*) of being an orator[4]:

> extemporalis audaciae atque ipsius temeritatis uel praecipua iucunditas est, nam ingenio quoque, sicut in agro, quamquam alia diu serantur atque elaborentur, gratiora tamen quae sua sponte nascuntur. (Tac. *Dial.* 6.6)
>
> the chief joy doubtlessly lies in the audacity of improvisation, in its very recklessness; for with the mind too, it is as in agriculture: although other things may be sown and tended for a long time, that which comes to birth spontaneously is more appealing.

We find here, used in connection with improvisation, not only the words "audacity" (*audacia*) and "temerity" (*temeritas*), as well as "to come to birth" (*nasci*), from the preface to Book 3, but also expressions which recall the preface to Book 1: the "joy" (*iucunditas*) for the composer (in the context also called *uoluptas*, as in Statius), and the results being "more appealing" (*gratiora*), which may be compared with "the appeal of swift composition" (*gratia celeritatis*) in Statius.

But before we conclude that Statius is referring to "improvisation", we must clarify what we mean by this term. Tacitus speaks of oral composition, i.e. of composition of the text at the moment of performance, and this is what is usually meant by "improvisation"[5]. However, *if* Statius performed (which will have to be investigated), he certainly performed texts he had previously written, as is apparent from his claim in the preface to Book 1 that none of his texts has been "worked at" (*tractum*: 14) for longer than two days. Moreover, he regularly uses the verb *scribere*, "to write" (1.*ep*.21–22, 2.*ep*.11, 16, 20), or the noun *stilus*, which means "style" or "composition", but retains its associations with the act of writing (cf. 3.*ep*.4, 4.*ep*.26, both already quoted; also 2.*ep*.16). So it is more precise not to speak of "improvisation", but of fast writing.

Writing is also the subject of a passage in Statius' contemporary Quintilian, which shows a number of verbal correspondences with

---

4 The two passages were already juxtaposed by Hardie 1983: 219, n. 15.

5 For "oral composition" (as distinguished from "oral performance" and "oral transmission") see Finnegan 1992: 16–24.

the preface to Book 1 of the *Silvae*. Quintilian is discussing writing as an exercise for orators, and after having spoken of those who write too slow, he continues:

> Diuersum est ... eorum uitium qui primo decurrere per materiam stilo quam uelocissimo uolunt, et sequentes calorem atque impetum ex tempore scribunt: hanc siluam uocant. Repetunt deinde et componunt quae effuderant: sed uerba emendantur et numeri, manet in rebus temere congestis quae fuit leuitas. (Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.17)

> A different error is made by those people who want to race through the subject with as fast a pen as possible, and in the heat of their impulses write ex tempore. This they call a *silua*. Afterwards they take it up again and arrange what they had turned out: but only the wording is improved and the rhythm, the contents that were recklessly thrown together retain their original superficiality.

The words "heat" (*calor*) and "to turn out" (*effundere*) occur also in Statius' preface (3, 14), yet it is highly unlikely that Quintilian is here criticising the poet, because his context is the training of orators; similarly, it is unlikely that Statius, in the passage quoted above from the preface to the fourth book, is answering such criticism, because the point there is publication, which it is not at issue in Quintilian[6]. But more important than the identity of Quintilian's targets or Statius' critics is the circumstance that the rhetor here conceives of a kind of improvisation in writing (*ex tempore scribunt*), resulting in a rough draft, which, he says, is called *silua*. This of course reminds of the title of Statius' collection.

Statius may have explained his choice of title in the lost final section of the preface to Book 1, but as it is, we have to look elsewhere for clues to his intentions[7]. The passage in Quintilian seems revealing: it uses a terminology partly identical with that used by Statius himself, and it testifies to a meaning for *silua* which would fit Sta-

[6] Delarue 1974: 544 and Coleman 1988: 58 suppose that Quintilian speaks of orators who publish their drafts. But the context is *exercitatio*. Statius' phrase *subito calore* recurs in Plin. *Pan*. 3.1 (with reference to spontaneous utterances of loyalty to the emperor, in contrast what people do *meditati*).

[7] The meaning of the title has often been discussed, i.a. by Vollmer 1898: 24–25, Frère 1961: I.xxvii–xxxiv, Newmyer 1979: 3–9, Bright 1980: 20–49, Hardie 1983: 76, van Dam 1984: 4 with nn. 41–42, Coleman 1988: xxii–xxiv, Adam 1988: 57–71, Delarue 1996, Schröder 1999: 49.

tius' title: *Siluae* would then mean something like "rapidly executed rough drafts". Such a meaning can also be assumed without difficulty for the only other ancient work known to have carried this title: the *Siluarum X* mentioned among the poetical works of Lucan by his biographer Vacca (78.15 Reiff.). Because Lucan died aged twenty-five, having written ten books of his epic *Bellum Ciuile* and many other works now lost, and because he was known as an improviser, the ten books of his *Silvae* (which may have been unpublished) could very well be a collection of improvisations or drafts[8].

It has been objected against this interpretation of the title that Statius should then have spoken of an individual poem as "a *silua*", which he never does[9]. However, the objection is hardly decisive, because one can very well understand that Statius did not write "the first rough draft has the emperor for witness" (cf. 1.*ep.*16), "then follows the rough draft dedicated to Rutilius Gallicus" (cf. 1.*ep.*27), etc. Moreover, the alternative explanation, that the title refers to variety (or unity-in-variety), is not very persuasive. The text quoted in support comes from Aulus Gellius, who discusses the various titles given to scholarly (not poetical) miscellanies:

> quia uariam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisiuerant, eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Namque alii *Musarum* inscripserunt, alii *Siluarum*, ... (Gel. *pr.*6)

> because they had searched out and brought together various and miscellaneous and as it were composite learning, they have also given titles most carefully selected to fit that meaning. For some have called their work *Musae*, others *Siluae*, ...

---

[8] Vacca provides a list of Lucan's other works at 78.14–79.2 Reiff., as does Statius himself at *Silv.* 2.7.54–63, but without mentioning the *Silvae* (unless the *Adlocutio ad Pollam* [cf. 62–63] belonged to that collection, as was suggested by Vollmer 1898: 377). Lucan's talents as an improviser appear from Vacca 77.18–19 Reiff. That Lucan's *Silvae* were unpublished can be suspected from Statius' silence and from the fact that Vacca mentions them together with a *tragoedia Medea inperfecta* (78.15–16 Reiff.). One may also perhaps compare Suet. *Gram.* 24 (on Valerius Probus): *Reliquit ... non mediocrem siluam obseruationum sermonis antiqui*, where the word (here in the singular) certainly denotes a text not made ready for publication. If there was indeed an association with unpublished texts, Statius' emphasis on publication in 1.*ep.*1–15 and 4.*ep.*25–34 would become more pointed.

[9] Hardie 1983: 76, van Dam 1984: 17, n. 42.

Although *silua* in the meaning "wood, forest" can easily be associated with variety (because a wood consists of a variety of trees), and although this association was spelled out by Sidonius Apollinaris in the fifth century and by many modern poets from the Seventeenth Century onwards[10], it is very uncertain whether even Gellius had this in mind. The title *Musae* does not in itself connote variety, and some of the other titles listed by Gellius have different primary associations, especially that of production "on the side" (thus παραξιφίδες [7] and πάρεργα [8]). In fact, Gellius may well have taken *siluae* as the plural of *silua* in the sense of "material", the meaning which underlies Quintilian's use of the term[11]. But even if Gellius did think of the variety of trees in a wood, the relevance to Statius must remain doubtful. If Statius intended this association, the plural of his title would make sense only if a single *silua* were a book (in which the individual poems were the trees), but he avoids to speak of a book as "a *silua*" just as cautiously as he avoids to speak of a poem as "a *silua*" (cf. 3.*ep*.7, 4.*ep*.25). So it is probable that Statius' audience associated the title *Silvae* in the first instance with the characteristic of his poems stressed in the prefaces: that of being hastily written. And this characteristic corresponds to their function of being immediate reactions to specific occasions in the life of their addressees.

But swift composition at an occasion does not necessarily entail that the functionality of the poem is exhausted at that occasion. *Silvae* 2.3, on a tree in the garden of Atedius Melior, was offered as a small gift for Melior's birthday; but this gift was meant to be immortal:

> Haec tibi parua quidem genitali luce paramus
> dona, sed ingenti forsan uictura sub aeuo. (2.3.62–63)

> This is the gift that I bring you on your birthday: small indeed, but perhaps destined to survive in the long ages to come.

[10] Cf. Sid. Ap. *Carm.* 9.229 *pingit* [scil. Statius] *gemmea prata siluularum*. For later titles see Adam 1988, who suggests (223–24) that they go back to Gevartius' explanation of Statius' title in his edition of 1616.

[11] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *silua* 5. It must be remarked, however, that the word in this meaning is attested only in the singular.

Because Statius could hardly expect that a poem of 75 lines would be transmitted by itself, he would seem to think of inclusion in a published book[12]; if so, we have a change of orientation since Book 1, which contained, as we have seen, poems for which publication was not originally envisaged. The problem will have to be discussed below, but here it may be noted that the idea of the poem as a lasting gift recurs in two other poems, both consolations. In the consolation to Claudius Etruscus, Statius contrasts Etruscus' perishable funeral offerings with his own:

> nos non arsura feremus
> munera, uenturosque tuus durabit in annos
> me monstrante dolor (3.3.37–39)

> I bring gifts that are not for burning, and through my description your grief will endure through the years to come.

And in the consolation to Abascantus, the poem is likewise compared to an everlasting funeral offering[13]:

> longa nec obscurum finem latura perenni
> temptamus dare iusta lyra (5.1.12–13).

> long-lasting and not destined to end in obscurity is the offering that I attempt to bring with eternal poetry.

Moreover, in both texts there is a further comparison of the poem with the grave monument itself, the *sepulcrum* (3.3.216, 5.1.15). This motif (which Statius also uses with reference to Lucan's poetry at *Silv.* 2.7.72) was conventional, and was likewise associated with the longevity of poetry[14]. So for this reason as well, it seems that Statius was anticipating publication in a book.

---

[12] The case is exactly parallel to that of Leon. 4 *FGE* = *AP* 6.325, a birthday gift (cf. 2) consisting in Μουσῶν στίχον ὅστις ἐς αἰεὶ/ μίμνει (3–4); Leonides certainly published his epigrams in books, as appears from 7 *FGE* = *AP* 6.328. In Mart. 7.84 (not on a birthday), the *parua ... dona* (5) which make the addressee live forever (6–8) consist in a *liber* (3); cf. also Mart. 5.5.

[13] The same comparison is made also in Mart. 10.26: Martial had not been able to bring offerings at the grave (which was in Egypt), *sed datur aeterno uicturum carmine nomen* (7).

[14] Already Ennius seems to have compared the *sepulchra* of kings with the immortality bestowed by poetry (404–06 Skutsch), to which Hor. *Carm.* 4.8.13–20 probably alludes (cf. Suerbaum 1968: 151–239). Poetry is often represented as a

But even if this conclusion should not be valid, the fact remains that Statius did himself publish the poems now to be read in the first four books of the *Silvae*. So we will have to discuss not only reception at occasions, but also reception upon publication. Beginning with the former, a distinction should be made according to whether the poetry was presented to the patron by way of an oral performance or in the form of a written text.

Oral Presentation

The two contexts for the oral performance of poetry in Early Imperial Rome were the dinner party (*cena*) and the specially organised recitation (*recitatio*). An extensive discussion of both contexts has been provided in Chapter 2 and will not be repeated here. I immediately begin by considering those poems in the *Silvae* that were probably or possibly delivered at dinner parties.

Of his poem on the baths of Claudius Etruscus (1.5), Statius claims that it was written *intra moram cenae* (1.*ep*.30), "within the time of a dinner"[15]. The poem itself is sympotic in character, stressing its own playfulness (9, 14), and containing instructions to a slave to pour wine in plenty (10–11), so that it could well have been performed at the same *cena* during which it was written. This would fit the parallel composition by Martial (6.42), of which the playful jocularity would be appropriate to the relaxed spirit reigning at the symposium.

The situation is somewhat more complex with respect to the poem on the statuette of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex (4.6). Statius relates in the introduction of the poem that he had seen the statuette at a dinner party given by Vindex (1–30), and this suggests that the description which follows had its origin in an improvised performance at Vindex' table; again, there are parallel epigrams by Martial

sepulchral *monumentum* more lasting than a real tomb, but more often with reference to the afterlife of the poet himself (Hor. *Carm.* 3.30, Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.71–80, *Eleg. Maec.* 1.37–38, *AL* 415 SB = Sen. *Epigr.* 26 Prato, Mart. 10.2.7–12) than with reference to the fame of the subject of the poetry (anon. *AP* 7.137.3, Prop. 3.2.17–26).

[15] For this meaning see Markland 1827: 160; Frère-Izaac 1961: 1.13 wrongly translate "pendant l'attente du dîner" and interpret "entre le bain at la *cena*" (n. 3).

to support such a hypothesis (9.43–44)[16]. However, the introduction, which looks back on the visit as a thing of the past (see esp. 4–5, 15–16, 20), was certainly composed after the event, so that the text as originally improvised must have been subsequently edited[17]. If this editing was done immediately afterwards, in order to present Vindex with a written text (rather than later, when the poem was included in the published Book 4), the character of Statius' *Silvae* as swiftly composed occasional poems would not have been betrayed.

Both the poem on the baths of Claudius Etruscus and that on the statuette of Novius Vindex originated from hospitality offered by the patron to the poet. The same applies to the two poems on a villa (1.3, 2.2) and the one on a temple on the precincts of a villa (3.1). All three poems may well have been written and performed during the poet's stay[18], and for the poem on the temple this is virtually certain, because Statius wrote it as soon as he had seen the building (3.*ep.*10). Different, however, is the poem on a tree in the garden of Atedius Melior's house (2.3), because that was offered, as we have seen, as a birthday gift of lasting value, therefore as a written text. But this, of course, does not preclude that the poem was *also* recited.

In the preface to Book 2, the poem on Melior's tree is coupled with that on his parrot (2.4): both are characterised as "light-weight texts, written as a kind of epigram" (*leues libellos quasi epigrammatis loco scriptos*: 2.*ep.*14–16). The poem on the parrot is a playful consolation on the death of the bird, in the tradition of Ovid (*Amores* 2.6) and, indirectly, Catullus (3)[19]; its humorous character allows the hypothesis that it was recited at a symposium. The poem contains

---

[16] Cf. p. 102.

[17] Apart from the addition of the introduction (1–30), at least the beginning of the descriptive part must have been revised, because the past-tense narrative is continued until mid-line in 36.

[18] Past tenses, such as *uidi* (1.3.47), etc., are no counter-argument, because they refer only to the inspection of the villa, not to the stay as a whole. In 1.3.13–14 *quae mente reporto/ gaudia*, the present tense may be thought to imply that Statius is still at the villa.

[19] Cf. Herrlinger 1930: 72–91, van Dam 1984: 337–41. One should add the famous *Columba*, written a few years earlier by Statius' patron Stella; because this was an elegy in the tradition of Catul. 3, Stella must have taken up Ov. *Am.* 2.6 before Statius did: see pp. 156, 297.

one indication that this may indeed have been the case. Addressing the dead parrot, Statius says:

> Hesternas, miserande, dapes moriturus inisti
> nobiscum, et gratae carpentem munera mensae
> errantemque toris mediae plus tempore noctis
> uidimus. (2.4.4–7)

> Only yesterday, poor creature, you shared our repast with us, already destined for death, and we saw you picking up the gifts of the welcome table and erring about the couches until past the hour of midnight.

What is interesting in these few lines is the "deixis", i.e. the way in which the utterance points to own context by means of "deictic" elements, i.e. such elements whose reference is dependent on the context of utterance[20]. In the text of Statius, deictic elements are the adjective *hesternas* (translated adverbially: "only yesterday")[21], the pronoun *nobiscum* ("with us"), and the person, number, and tense of the verb *uidimus* ("we saw"). These elements fix the context of utterance as being on the day after the parrot's death and within the circle of the dinner company of the previous day. It is a plausible, if not a necessary, assumption that this company was again assembled for dinner when it heard Statius' poem.

But there is an important complication. A further deictic element in the lines just quoted is the second person address to the dead parrot, indicated by the vocative case in *miserande* ("poor creature") and the second person in *inisti* (translated as "you shared"). This address is fictional, just as the address later on to other birds, who are exhorted to come and carry the parrot to the pyre (22–23). So a suspicion arises that the rest of the deixis is also fictional. However, it often happens that one part of a context of utterance is fictional, whereas other parts are real[22], and the casual nature of the deixis in *hesternas*, *nobiscum*, and *uidimus* is perhaps an argument for its reality. On the other hand, the deixis in the exhortation to the other

---

[20] On deixis in general see e.g. Levinson 1983: 54–96. The use of deixis for the establishment of the contexts of utterance (real or fictional) in ancient lyric poetry was pioneered by Rösler 1983; a recent discussion is to be found in Felson 1999 (with references).

[21] *Hesternas* is a correction for M's *externas*. Markland 1827: 238 suggested *extremas*, but that would destroy the opposition with *At nunc* (8).

[22] See p. 49.

birds, which situates the context of utterance at the cremation ceremony (cf. also 34–37), is obviously a poetic device, and may therefore be fictional. If so, Statius did not deliver his poem at the funeral ceremony. But he may still have delivered it at a symposium: fictional deixis does not rule out that the poem was meant for oral delivery, it only rules out that the poem was meant for delivery in the context of utterance presupposed by the deixis: delivery in another context remains possible[23].

The problem of fictional deixis is also encountered in Statius' other, serious consolations. In *Silvae* 2.1, Statius claims that he often sang at the funeral ceremony itself:

> me fulmine in ipso
> audiuere patres; ego iuxta busta profusis
> matribus at<que> piis cecini solacia natis
> et mihi, cum proprios gemerem defectus ad ignes
> (quem, Natura!) patrem. (2.1.30–34)

> to me fathers, still thunder-struck, have listened; I have sang consolations to mothers prostrate next to the pyre and to loving children, even to myself, when, shattered by a cremation of my own, I mourned (whom, o Nature!) my father.

But one should inquire if this is not a reference to the fictional, rather than the real, context of utterance of the poems in question[24]. The mention made of singing may arouse suspicion, especially because we read a few lines earlier:

> Iamne canam? Lacrimis en et mea carmine in ipso
> ora natant tristesque cadunt in uerba liturae. (17–18)

> Shall I sing yet? Look, my face swims with tears in the midst of my song and sad blots fall on my words.

---

[23] Rösler 1983 (and elsewhere) holds that fictional deixis is incompatible with primary orality, but he rightly abandons this view (although with some theoretical equivocation) in Rösler 1990. It may be noted that the compatibility of primary orality and fictional deixis includes the deictic element "I", in other words that a fictional "I" is very well possible in poems meant for oral delivery; cf. e.g. Slings 1990.

[24] If 33–34 is a reference to *Silv.* 5.3, as seems undeniable, Statius is inaccurate, because in that poem he states that he is singing three months after the cremation (29–33): not *defectus ad ignes*, but *adclinis tumulo* (36). Cf. further pp. 195–198.

Here the representation of the poet as a singer is incongruously juxtaposed with the representation of the poet as a writer: the words on the page are being blotted out by tears. At first sight one might try to reconcile the two representations by observing that Statius is trying to sing from a manuscript prepared in advance, but parallels show that *carmine in ipso* ("in the midst of my song") must refer to the moment of composition[25]. So it is better to take "singing" here as a trope for the production of poetry, in this case used paradoxically: Statius asks whether he may start with his poem, although the poem has, of course, already begun. In the same way, a few lines further on, he states that he is using his lyre not to play on, but to beat his breast with (26–28).

But even if Statius' claim to have sung is not to be taken literally, his claim to have performed "next to the pyre" could still conceivably be true. The claim is in harmony with the context of utterance that Statius specifies at the beginning of *Silvae* 2.1, where he situates himself, together with the grieving Melior, "in front of the pyre, while the ashes are still glowing" (*ante rogos et adhuc uiuente fauilla*: 2). But the following lines presuppose that Melior has been grieving for some time now (3–18) and go on to describe the funeral ceremony in the perfect tense (19–25), returning to the context of utterance with *nunc* (26). Similarly, later on (157–82), the funeral ceremony is again described, this time partly in the present tense, but also in the imperfect and perfect tenses. The conclusion must be that the poem was not really meant for performance at the ceremony.

This conclusion is supported by further instances of apparently fictional deixis. Thus, in verse 76 Statius refers to Melior's house with the adverbs *hic*, "here", and *hinc*, "hence". But Statius cannot of course be at the same time in Melior's house, which was on the Caelius (2.3.14–16), and near the funeral pyre, which was outside the city walls, on the via Flaminia (175–78; cf. Mart. 6.28.5). Moreover, after the second description of the ceremony, Statius uses yet another type of fiction. He first consoles Melior by anticipating, in future tenses, that the dead Glaucias will find a friendly welcome in the

---

[25] See Prop. 4.3.3–4, Ov. *Ep.* 3.3, *Tr.* 1.1.13–14, 3.1.15–16 (*Tr.* 3.5.13–14, although verbally close, has a different meaning).

underworld (183–88)[26], and then, at 189–90, he reacts, in the present tense, to the sudden arrival of Mercury, who reports that Glaucias has been received in Elysium by Melior's friend Blaesus (191–207). This technique, which is not uncommon in ancient poetry, has been termed "mimetic": one may define a mimetic poem (or part of a poem) as a poem (or part of a poem) in which the speaker reacts to an event which occurs during the time in which he is speaking[27]. In principle, the (changing) context of utterance of a mimetic poem may be real, but in that case very specific conditions must be fulfilled: either the poet could exactly anticipate the events to which he would react, or the staging of the poem was rehearsed beforehand, or the poet composed ex tempore. It is obvious that usually none of these three condition was fulfilled, so that the context of utterance of mimetic poems will generally have been fictional[28]. Statius could have been improvising, but their is no need to assume this, since the event to which he is reacting is fictional in any case.

The mimetic technique, which in *Silvae* 2.1 is employed for only part of the poem, extends over the entire poem in *Silvae* 2.6, the consolation to Flavius Ursus. At the beginning Ursus is addressed in the present tense as moaning and weeping (6–15), whereas at the end the cremation is described in the perfect tense (85–93), so that one may think that it has taken place in the mean time, as Statius was speaking[29]. But the time needed to speak some seventy lines of verse is of course much shorter than the time taken up by a funeral ceremony, and this temporal contraction is in itself a sign of fiction[30].

---

[26] A future tense is already used at 155, where van Dam 1984: 144–45 has convincingly changed the transmitted *subiuit* to *subibit*.

[27] Cf. Albert 1988, who defines (24) with the help of the term "Szenerieveränderung", holding that the decisive concept is "Szenerie" (21). But it is rather "event" (which of course encompasses "action"), and Albert's typology of mimetic poems (220–29) is really a typology of possible events to which a speaker may react. Albert's study stops at Ovid and so does not include Statius.

[28] For the first two conditions this is argued by Albert 1988: 46–53, 72–76; the third condition is not discussed by Albert, but Hardie 1983: 82–83 suggests that it was often fulfilled, i.a. in mimetic symposiastic and epithalamian poems, but his only argument is a misinterpretation of Cic. *Arch.* 18 (cf. van Dam 1988: 707).

[29] Such structuring is no innovation by Statius: it already informs Ov. *Am.* 3.9, on the death of Tibullus; cf. Albert 1988: 237–38.

[30] Cf. Albert 1988: 51–52 and elsewhere (see index s.v. "Zeitraffung").

It is not much different in *Silvae* 3.3, the consolation to Claudius Etruscus, although there the amount of text between the description of the beginning of the cremation (33–37) and its end (178–82), which are both described as taking place in the present, is greater. But already at the very beginning of the poem the cremation is described as being in process (8–12), so that the mimetic utterance is not quite precise. Moreover, not only the temporal, also the local deixis is contradictory: when Statius reports the words that Claudius Etruscus addresses to the still warm ashes of his father, he has him refer to his house as being "here" (*hic*: 196). Such inconsistencies imply that the setting is fictional.

In the last of Statius' consolations for a patron, *Silvae* 5.1, for Flavius Abascantus, the context of utterance is specified as being a year after the death of Abascantus' wife Priscilla (16–17), and this perspective is maintained throughout the poem. Nevertheless, at the end there is a piece of "mimetic" fiction: the arrival of Priscilla in Elysium is described as being contemporaneous with Statius' speaking (249–62). In other poems this event is put either immediately after the death (2.4.8–9, 2.6.80–81) or after the cremation (2.1.183–207, 3.3.205–07). Here Statius anomalously puts it a year later, to achieve an effective close to his poem.

So none of Statius' consolations for a patron was performed at the funeral[31], even if some poems, in whole or in part, employ the fiction that they were. The question now becomes whether this conclusion may be extended to the other poems which celebrate a more or less ceremonial occasion in the life of the addressee, such as a wedding, a birthday or a departure.

To begin with Statius' only published poem on a wedding, the epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla (1.2). This poem shows the same "mimetic" technique as do some of the consolations, but more elaborately and systematically, as a paraphrase will bring out. The speaker begins with questions: for whom is meant the bridal song that is being chanted by Apollo and the nine Muses (among whom

[31] The statement also holds for the funeral pieces that Statius wrote for his own use: 5.3, on his father, was begun after three months (29–33), 5.5, on his *puer*, after one month (24–26).

Elegy is appearing as the tenth), while Venus is escorting the bride (1–15)? Then the answer is given:

> Nosco diem causasque sacri: te concinit iste
> (pande fores), te, Stella, chorus (1.2.16–17)

> Now I understand the day, and the causes of the rite: it is you this chorus (throw open the doors), it is you, Stella, they sing of

The reason that Statius (as I will henceforth call the speaker) can give this answer is that the procession has now arrived at Stella's house, as is shown by the injunction to open the doors, so that the guests may enter[32]. In the following lines Statius reports (still in the present tense), how Stella welcomes his bride by embracing her, and how the pair are being showered with flowers (17–23)[33]. Then he draws the conclusion:

> Ergo dies aderat Parcarum conditus albo
> uellere, quo Stellae Violentillaeque professus
> clamaretur hymen. (24–26)

> Yes, the day has arrived that was established by white wool of the Parcae, the day at which the bridal song of Stella and Violentilla would be chanted openly.

In the Latin, the imperfect is used for the arrival of the day, but this is a syntactic Graecism not uncommon in Latin poetry, used when one suddenly realises that something is the case and has been the case all along[34]. Statius now more fully realises the character of the day, and specifies the names of both the bride and the groom. He continues with present tenses, and at 46–50 sets out to recount the

---

[32] This has been misunderstood by Hardie 1983: 226, n. 43, because he wrongly thinks that already at this point of the poem the context of utterance is outside the closed doors of the marriage chamber. More correctly, if too cursorily: Pederzani 1995: 29–30, 44.

[33] My formulation presupposes that the bridegroom did not participate in the *deductio* (otherwise Statius' questions in 1–15 would not be comprehensible). Also in Catul. 61, the bridegroom waits for his bride in his house (164–66), in spite of his being addressed during the *deductio* (133–41) (but cf. below, p. 266, n. 40).

[34] *Ergo .. erat* is the exact equivalent of ἦν ἄρα. The standard example of the Greek idiom is Hes. *Op.* 11 Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος; see West *ad loc.* for parallels (also without the negative). For the idiom in Latin poetry see Fraenkel 1957: 324–25, n. 3.

history of the courtship, while the guests are still in the process of entering Stella's house:

> Sed quae causa toros inopinaque gaudia uatis
> attulit? Hic mecum, dum feruent agmine postes
> atriaque et multa pulsantur limina uirga,
> hic, Erato iocunda, doce. Vacat apta mouere
> conloquia, et docti norunt audire penates. (46–50)
>
> But what cause has brought about the marriage and the unexpected joys of the poet? Here, where I stand, while the doorways and halls bristle with the crowd and the thresholds are struck by many a rod, here, lovely Erato, help me tell the story. There is time for fitting conversation, and the learned house knows how to listen.

The word "cause" (46, repeated from 16) introduces a long and sophisticated "aetiological" narrative[35]. In the course of it, Venus and Amor, as part of their exertions to bring the lovers together, deliver encomiastic speeches on both bride and groom, and on the institution of marriage itself, thus acquitting the poet of some of the conventional requirements for the epithalamium[36]. The story is continued through the wedding day (description of which is another conventional requirement), and naturally concludes with a renewed reference to the "day", now in the perfect tense:

> Hic fuit ille dies: noctem canat ipse maritus,
> quantum nosse licet. (241–42)
>
> Such was that day: the night may be sung by the husband himself, in so far as knowledge is allowed.

As Statius was speaking, night has fallen, and apparently he has moved with the other guests to the wedding chamber, for the following lines describe (by means of a series of comparisons) the bride lying on the bridal bed as her husband approaches (242–46). Then Statius calls on other poets, and especially on Stella's colleagues in

---

[35] The combination of *causa* (46) with *docere* (49) suggests Ovid's *Fasti* (cf. 3.407–08, 4.682), as did already the combination of *causae* with *dies* (16) (cf. 2.382, 3.812, 4.17; also 1.1), although Statius' hexameter narrative is closer to the *Metamorphoses*. *Causa* is also introduced to introduce an Ovidian aetiological narrative at *Silv*. 2.3.6 and 3.1.1 (cf. 49: *exordia*).

[36] Cf. Keydell 1962: 931–33, Hardie 1983: 111–15. The implications of the phrase "conventional requirements" are discussed below, pp. 272–277.

elegy, that "now" (*nunc*: 247) they should sing (247–55), just as he will sing himself (256–65). The reference is to the "epithalamium" in the original sense of the song delivered ἐπὶ τῷ θαλάμῳ ("at the wedding chamber"), and its basic content makes up the end of the poem: a mixture of exhortation and good wishes on the themes of children (266–73), marital concord (273–75), and long life (275–77).

So Statius in this poem uses the "mimetic" technique of having the spatial and temporal point of view of the speaker move along with the events that this speaker describes. This technique was used in wedding poems before Statius, most notably by Catullus in poem 61[37]. There the speaker, after an invocation to the god of marriage (1–75), bids the bride to come forth from her house (76–113), then, when she has done so (115), accompanies the procession to the house of the bridegroom (114–48), and upon arrival there (149) successively addresses the bride as she enters the house (149–73), her attendants as they lead her into the wedding chamber (174–83), and the bridegroom as he joins her (184–98); finally he addresses both together (199–228) on the subject of children (204–23) and marital happiness (199–203, 225–28), until at the end of the poem the doors of the wedding chamber are closed (224)[38].

The question for both poems is whether the "moving" context of utterance, as indicated by the deictic elements in the text, was real or fictional. With respect to the poem by Catullus, the common view that the poem was really recited (or sung) in the course of the festival proceedings, is refuted by obvious cases of temporal contraction: thus, the procession from the house of the bride to that of the bridegroom must have taken appreciably longer than the time needed to perform thirty-five very short lines of poetry. The hypothesis of real deixis can only be upheld if one assumes that the performer or performers made a number of pauses, some of these of rather long dura-

---

[37] Catullus probably had Hellenistic predecessors, but these are lost. Wheeler 1930: 218–22 = 1934: 201–05 attempts to trace the type back to Sappho, but Sappho probably wrote separate songs for separate stages of the wedding; see Page 1955: 119–26, and cf. Albert 1988: 42–46.

[38] As is now customary, I give the line-numbers without making allowance for the lacunas (four lines after 78, three after 107). For discussion of the mimetic structure of the poem see Albert 1988: 105–10.

tion, but this does not seem credible[39]. In the case of Statius' poem, it is not exactly clear what is supposed to happen between 46–50, when the guests are still entering, and 247, when the bridal pair have withdrawn into the wedding chamber. One would assume that during this time the wedding meal took place; if so, even two hundred lines would be too short to cover the time, and again we would have to suppose long pauses in the recitation[40]. It is preferable to assume that the "moving" context of utterance of the poem is fictional. Yet this does not imply that the real context of utterance cannot have been at the wedding: the possibility remains that Statius presented his fiction to his audience at some point during the ceremonies, most plausibly at the wedding meal. But then the description in the present tense of events which had occurred earlier that day (1–50) or were still to come (247–77) would be rather odd.

If a decision is to be reached, evidence outside the text itself is needed. Perhaps some help is to be had from the preface to the book in which the poem was published. Statius there claims that his description of the equestrian statue of Domitian (1.1) was offered to the emperor on the day after the dedication. He then has a fictional interlocutor object that this does not yet prove composition within a single day, because he could have seen the statue in advance[41]. Statius answers that Stella will attest that the epithalamium which he (Stella) had ordered was written in two days, although that poem had three hundred lines (1.*ep.*17–23). If Stella had commissioned the poem two days before the marriage, he would have shown a willingness to take risks or a great confidence in his fellow-poet, but this is not what Statius stresses. He asks Stella to confirm not the date of

[39] It does seem credible, however, to Albert 1988: 110–17. Wiseman 1985: 199, who also favours performance of the poem "simultaneously with, and as part of, the ceremonies it describes", does not discuss the problem of temporal contraction.

[40] Vollmer 1898: 237 states that Statius everywhere sticks to the point of view of the wedding meal, but in 46–50 there is no hint of a convivial setting, and from 241 onwards the speaker is clearly outside the wedding chamber. But it is true that the wedding meal would have taken place between lines 51 and 240, if it was held in the house of the bridegroom after the arrival of the bride, as indeed seems to have been the custom in Rome (cf. Tränkle 1981: 254 with n. 38). However, there is much uncertainty, and the standard handbooks (as also the commentators on Catul. 61 and 62) give divergent accounts (and Treggiari 1991: 161–70 evades the question).

[41] On the text and interpretation of this passage see p. 350.

the order, but the date of delivery of the poem, and this suggests that the order was issued on the wedding-day, and the poem was handed to its addressee two days later. This would complete the analogy with the poem on Domitian's equestrian statue, which was also handed to its addressee shortly after the ceremony in which it purports to take part.

We are confronted with similar problems in the poems of departure. Both *Silvae* 3.2, for Maecius Celer, and *Silvae* 5.2, for Crispinus, the son of Vettius Bolanus, are consistently mimetic. In *Silvae* 3.2, Statius begins by praying to the deities of the sea and the winds (1–49), and then observes in the present tense: "My prayer is heard" (*Audimur*: 50). Keeping to the present tense, he describes how the ship is made ready for sailing, and adds (now using future tenses) that he will be the last to leave the ship as it is putting out to sea (50–60). A complaint on the invention of navigation follows (61–77), during which the poet apparently has gone ashore, because he goes on to point out that the ship is gradually disappearing from view (78–80). The poem then continues with expressions of affection (80–100), a prayer for safe arrival which includes a description of the destination (101–26), and finally anticipation of Celer's return (127–43). So again we see Statius employing the fiction of the poet who sings of the occasion as it unfolds before his eyes. Interestingly enough he describes his reunion with Celer in terms of this fiction:

> O tum quantus ego aut quanta uotiua mouebo
> plectra lyra, cum me magna ceruice ligatum
> attolles umeris (131–33)

> O, how happy shall I be, and with what force shall I play on my lyre the songs that I vowed, when, clinging about your strong neck, I will be lifted to your shoulders

It is hard to imagine that Statius will be playing his lyre when clinging about Celer's neck, and just as hard to believe that he is playing his lyre as the ship lifts its anchors[42]. But again, this in itself does not tell against recitation at some valedictory gathering: it only implies that *if* the poem were recited at such a gathering, the audience would

[42] On the fiction that the poet always has his lyre to hand cf. Heinze 1923: 186–88 (with reference to Horace's *Odes*).

have to accept the fiction that the ship was already sailing, although at that moment it was still waiting in the harbour.

In *Silvae* 5.2 the context of utterance lies entirely before the departure, but nevertheless the poet reacts to a change occurring in that context. The situation imagined at the beginning is that Crispinus is about to undertake a short holiday trip to Etruria. Although it is not a long journey nor a dangerous one, the poet is overcome by grief (1–7), and wonders how he will feel when Crispinus will be called upon to serve as a military tribune in foreign parts (8–11). Such an appointment is soon to be expected, because Crispinus, though still very young, is exceptionally qualified. In the course of elaborating on Crispinus' merits, the poet becomes ever more confident about an impending tribunate, until at line 167 a messenger from the emperor arrives with a letter of nomination. So after all Crispinus is not going to Etruria, and Statius has all the time been celebrating a departure on official duty. This is clearly fictional, and *if* Statius recited at some kind of leave-taking ceremony, the emperor's letter had arrived well before then.

There are also a few poems in which the deixis situates the context of utterance on the occasion celebrated, but where there is no mimetic structure to reveal whether or not this context of utterance is fictional. Thus in *Silvae* 3.4, on the dedication of the locks of Earinus in the temple of Aesculapius at Pergamum, the first words *Ite comae* situate the poem just before the locks are sent away, and this situation does not change throughout the poem[43]. Similarly, in *Silvae* 2.7, there is nothing which tells against the assumption that the text is what it purports to be: a recitation at a commemoration of Lucan's birthday, organised by his widow Polla. Finally, the context of utterance of *Silvae* 1.4, on the recovery from illness of Rutilius Gallicus, is not necessarily fictional, but in this case the text offers another indication that the poem might not have been meant for recitation. Statius asks Gallicus not to spurn being honoured by such a slight personage as himself (36), which suggests that the poem was unbidden[44]; because it is hard to assume that a poet would recite without

---

[43] Vollmer 1898: 384 asserts that the poem proves by its form and contents that it played no role at the actual dedication, but gives no adstruction of his view.

[44] Cf. p. 244.

having been asked to do so, Statius' words are perhaps a sign that his poem was offered in manuscript.

To summarise: those poems of Statius which are written in connection with a more or less ceremonial occasion (a funeral, a wedding, a departure, a dedication, a birthday, a recovery) usually adopt that occasion as their context of utterance; whenever this context changes in the course of the poem (in other words: whenever the poem is mimetic), it can safely be set down as fictional; whenever it does not change, it need not be fictional, although of course it may be. But even if the poem was not recited precisely under the circumstances it refers to, it may still have been recited under other circumstances. In order to decide whether that was the case, we need outside evidence. The prefaces give only fitful help, and there is no other direct information. Therefore we might ask if anything can be learnt from the tradition in which these poems stand.

It is striking that almost all of the types of poems I have just enumerated are called by a Greek technical name in the *Silvae*[45]: a funerary poem is called an *epicedion* (2.*ep*.8, 5.1.*tit*., 5.3.*tit*., 5.5.*tit*.), but also in Latin a *consolatio* (2.*ep*.20, 2.6.*tit*., 3.3.*tit*.)[46], the wedding poem an *epithalamium* (1.*ep*.21, 1.2.*tit*.), the poem on the departure of Maecius Celer a *propempticon* (3.2.*tit*.), the poem on Lucan's birthday a *genethliacon* (2.*ep*.22, 2.7.*tit*.)[47]; moreover, the poem on the recovery of Rutilius Gallicus is called *soteria* (1.4.*tit*.). It is also striking that three of these names, *epithalamium*, *propempticon*, and *genethliacon*, as well as *consolatio* in its Greek form παραμυθητικός (λόγος), recur as names for types of speeches in later rhetorical theory, most notably in a late third-century treatise attributed to Menander Rhetor and in a roughly contemporary treatise preserved under the name of the Augustan rhetor Dionysius of

[45] The exceptions are 3.4, on the locks of Earinus, and 5.2, on the departure of Crispinus; as these two poems are not very relevant for the questions I propose to discuss below, I will leave them out of account.

[46] The words are synonymous in Statius, which appears most clearly from his use of *solacia* (2.*ep*.12) for the *epicedion* (2.*ep*.8) on Glaucias; moreover, there is no significant difference between the poems called *epicedion* and those called *consolatio*; cf. van Dam 1984: 67.

[47] A similar title is *eucharisticon* for a thanksgiving to the emperor (4.2.*tit*.).

Halicarnassus[48]. This leads to the question whether perhaps Statius' poems stand in an oratorical tradition (i.e. in a tradition of speeches) and perhaps also in a rhetorical tradition (i.e. in a tradition of prescripts given for speeches). But before this question can be answered two preliminary questions need to be briefly discussed: whether the names found in the titles of the individual poems were given by Statius, and whether these names could not derive from poetical rather than rhetorical theory.

It is often held that the transmitted titles for the individual poems in the *Silvae* were not given by Statius himself, but by a later philologist, either shortly after Statius' death or in the third or fourth century[49]. If either of these hypotheses is true, then from among the titles just mentioned, *propempticon* and *soteria* do not stem from Statius himself, because they only occur in the titles of the respective poems. But it can be argued that Statius wrote with these titles in mind.

To begin with *propempticon*. In the preface to Book 3 Statius writes that he has "sent" Celer "on his way" with the poem, using the verb *prosequi* (3.*ep.*13–14), the equivalent of the Greek verb προπέμπειν, from which the word *propempticon* is derived. Moreover, it is almost certain that *propempticon* was a technical term already in Statius' time, because we know of a commentary *in Cinnae Propempticon* by the famous Augustan philologist Julius Hyginus[50]. So the expression in the preface is clearly meant as a paraphrase. Quite similarly, the expression *gratias egi* in the preface to Book 4

48 On date and authorship see Russell and Wilson 1981: xxxiv–xl (on Men. Rh., "Treatise II") and 363 (on [D.H.] *Rh.*, chs. 1–7). In these treatises, the names for the types of speech are masculine (scil. λόγος) or (in Menander) sometimes feminine (scil. λαλιά), not neuter, but this I will disregard in what follows.

49 The first view is proposed by Coleman 1988: xxviii–xxxii, the second by van Dam 1984: 69–72. But see for a convincing argument that the titles are original Schröder 1999: 180–89.

50 The commentary is known from a quotation by the fourth-century philologist Charisius (Cinna fr. 4 Courtney [1993: 217] = fr. 5 *FPL*^{3} [220]), but he is unlikely to have changed Hyginus' title. Elsewhere Charisius directly refers to Cinna's poem, calling it *Propempticon Pollionis* (fr. 1), and this may well have been the original title, because Cinna's Greek protégé Parthenius is likewise credited with a προπεμπτικόν (by the sixth-century philologist Stephanus of Byzantium: *SH* 639). See further Courtney 1993: 214–17.

(4.*ep*.6) seems to paraphrase the Greek title *eucharisticon* of poem 4.2[51].

With *soteria* the situation is somewhat more complex. The word, a neuter plural, means a thank-offering for deliverance or recovery, but occurs nowhere else as a term of literary theory[52]. So it is unlikely that it was given by a later editor. On the other hand, the title adequately expresses a metaphor inherent in the text itself, that of the poem as a sacrificial offering (1.4.127–31)[53]. The choice of title is therefore in all probability Statius' own.

Of the remaining terms, *epicedion*, *consolatio*, *epithalamium*, *propempticon*, and *genethliacon*, it may be asked whether Statius necessarily took them from rhetorical theory, or whether he could not also have derived them from "grammatical" theory, i.e. the theory of poetry. An *epicedion* originally was a dirge, and even in the later rhetorical theory the term seems to have kept its associations with poetry[54]. The word *epithalamium* likewise originally denoted a type of song; in the course of time it came also to be used for poetry that was recited[55]. *Propempticon*, as we have seen, occurs as a title of

[51] On that hypothesis εὐχαριστικόν would have been a technical term already known to Statius, although all other occurrences in Latin are much later: see *ThLL* 5.1004.76–1005.2 (and add Sid. Ap. *Carm.* 16.*tit*.). Philo repeatedly uses εὐχαριστικὸς ὕμνος (cf. Färber 1937: 363), but this might derive from a Jewish tradition of classifying the *Psalms* (some of which are labelled εὐχαριστικοί in later theological literature).

[52] See F. Pfister, "Soteria (2)", *RE* II.3.1 (1927), 1221–31; at Mart. 12.56.3 the word means "*gifts* for recovery". Coleman 1988: xxx, n. 43 takes Statius' title as feminine singular.

[53] Cf. Hardie 1996: 263–64. The metaphor of the poem as offering occurs more often in the *Silvae*: see above, p. 255, on *Silv.* 3.3 and 5.1; cf. also 3.1.163–64 and 3.2.131–32 (with Laguna 1992: 237).

[54] [D.H.] *Rh.* 6.1, in speaking of funeral speeches for individuals, writes that poetry is full of these, and that they (i.e. apparently the funeral speeches contained in the poems) are called ἐπικήδειοι (scil. λόγοι) or θρῆνοι (278.9–10 U.–R.). On the term ἐπικήδειον itself see Färber 1936: I.38–39, II.53–54.

[55] On ἐπιθαλάμιον see Färber 1936: I.37, II.49–50, Muth 1954: 36–45, Russell and Wilson 1981: 309. At Luc. *Symp.* 41 a guest reads (ἀναγνώσομαι ... ἀνεγίνωσκεν) an ἐπιθαλάμιον (consisting of four elegiac distichs), which however employs the fiction that is sung (ἄμμες δὴ αὖθ' ὑμῖν τοῦτον θαλαμήϊον ὕμνον/ ... ᾀσόμεθα); cf. 21, where a written text is (wrongly) suspected to be an ἐπιθαλάμιον.

poems well before Statius[56]. So much cannot be said for *genethliacon*, which does occur elsewhere as a title for poetry, but only at a time later than the treatises of Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius[57]. But this remaining uncertainty is not sufficient to undermine the conclusion that Statius probably derived his vocabulary not from rhetorical theory, but from the theory of poetry that he had learned in the school of his father, the Greek *grammaticus*.

Yet even though the titles do not constitute evidence, the question remains whether Statius in his *Silvae* is dependent on rhetorical theory. This question is relevant in the context of the present chapter, because rhetorical theory presupposes oratorical practice, so that a further question is implied: whether Statius' occasional poems were written in the tradition of occasional speeches current in his time. Admittedly, an affirmative answer to this second question would not be proof that Statius' poems were ceremonially recited, nor would a negative answer be proof that they were not, but nevertheless a brief consideration of evidence and arguments will (I hope) shed some light on the ways in which Statius' poems were offered to their audiences.

It has long been recognised that the correspondences between Statius' *Silvae* and the prescriptions of Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius are not confined to names, but extend to motifs and compositional principles[58]. However, the discussion about the relevance of these rhetors to ancient poetry in general and to Statius in particular has received new impulses from the publication, in 1972, of Francis Cairns' book *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, where it is claimed that Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius are "good witnesses to the literary practice of the whole of antiquity"[59]. In assessing this claim, we should distinguish

[56] For later, rhetorical, uses of the word see Färber 1937: 361–62.

[57] Ausonius wrote a *Genethliacos* (9 Green) for his grandson; Servius calls Virgil's fourth eclogue the *genethliacon Salonini* (*Buc. pr.* 3.22–23 Th. and on 4.1); for speeches see Burgess 1902: 143–46.

[58] These correspondences have been systematically discussed by Lohrisch 1905. A more recent (but very superficial) survey is found in Newmyer 1979: 15–44.

[59] Cairns 1972: 73; cf. similar formulations at 31, 36, and elsewhere.

more firmly than is done by Cairns himself between three levels at which the composition of poetry is, or can be, bound by rules[60].

First, there is the level of pragmatics. In any given culture there are general rules which govern the performance of certain speech events (such as taking leave of someone or consoling someone over a death); these rules generally remain fairly constant over time. Secondly, there is the level of poetic convention. In the domain of poetry, there are special rules which govern the development of certain "genres" (such as the propempticon or the *consolatio*); these special rules are more subject to historical change than are the general rules[61]. Thirdly, there is the level of theory. In theoretical disciplines (such as rhetoric) rules are formulated *explicitly* (whether with descriptive or prescriptive intent): these explicit rules are tied to the continuities and innovations of the discipline to which they belong.

But theorists do not devise their rules within a vacuum, and so it is with Menander Rhetor. In giving his instructions for speeches in which certain speech events are to be performed, he clearly tries to take account of the pragmatics of these speech events in his society. Moreover, he draws not only on the conventions of oratory (the domain for which he legislates), but also on those of poetry, as he himself often asseverates, and he advises his pupils on how to derive motifs and compositional principles from the poets[62]. This implies that if we find correspondences between Menander Rhetor and an earlier poet, these correspondences may be due to the circumstance that both belong to the same culture or to the fact that Menander's rhetorical prescriptions reflect poetic conventions[63]. Only if the correspondences cannot be explained in this way, do we need to postulate that the poet has used rhetorical precepts similar to those of Menander. In that case we would have to assume that Menander faithfully reproduces a theory much earlier than himself.

---

60 The distinction has been articulated by Du Quesnay 1981: 55–58.

61 Objections have often been raised to Cairns' use of the term "genre", but if a genre is defined as a diachronical series of works which is perceived as such by the literary community, there is no reason not to call the propempticon, the *consolatio*, etc. a "genre". Cf. Nauta 1990: 116–20.

62 Cf. e.g. Men. Rh. 393.5–16, 402.15–20, 405.19–22, 434.11–18, also [D.H.] *Rh.* 4.1 (270.4–15 U.-R.).

63 On these points cf. J. Griffin 1981 = 1985: 48–64.

Cairns himself never makes this assumption (at least not explicitly), with one exception, which significantly enough concerns Statius. In discussing *Silvae* 1.4, the *Soteria Rutilii Gallici*, he writes that rhetorical prescriptions for the *soteria* must have existed (although he has to admit that there is no evidence), and that Statius must have consciously worked with these[64]. This claim does not concern a genre dealt with by Menander Rhetor, but nevertheless we cannot evade the question when rhetorical instruction for the Menandrian genres first came into existence.

The question was firmly posed by Ian Du Quesnay, who argued that such instruction was in any case already current by the first century B.C.E. Unfortunately, his arguments amount to little more than *petitio principii*, e.g. when he states that ancient rhetoric did not change after the first century B.C.E., or that the first century B.C.E. must have seen a vogue for exercises in the epideictic branch of rhetoric, because there were vogues for exercises in the judicial and deliberative branches (the *controuersiae* and *suasoriae*). In our context the gravest circularity is the argument that Statius "doubtless" received a rhetorical education along Menandrian lines[65].

Alex Hardie, in his book on the *Silvae*, has returned to specific comparisons of individual poems with the corresponding prescriptions in Menander[66]. But there is a complication, because Hardie, unlike Du Quesnay, does not think that the Augustan poets already worked from what he calls "the new rhetoric". This entails that a distinction is made between those poems in Statius' *Silvae* which imitate Augustan models and those which (according to Hardie) do not. An example of the first group is the propempticon to Maecius Celer (3.2), which imitates Horace (*Carm.* 1.3) and Ovid (*Am.* 2.11), and does not show the "formal encomium" characteristic of Menandrian precept[67]. Hardie's prime example of the second group is the

[64] Cairns 1972: 74–75, 154. Him. *Or.* 45 Colonna (mentioned at 75), a short λαλιὰ εἰς τὸ ὑγιαίνειν τὸν ἑταῖρον, cannot be considered evidence that "the soteria" was taught in the rhetorical schools. Cf. above, p. 271, for the proposal that *soteria* is an *ad hoc* coinage by Statius.

[65] Du Quesnay 1981: 57–58, referring to Russell and Wilson 1981: xxxiv, for whom this was "obviously" the case.

[66] See Hardie 1983: 103–18 and 91–102 on the background.

[67] Cf. Hardie 1983: 156–64, esp. 158.

consolation to Flavius Ursus (2.6), which, he contends, does show such formal encomium. The problem with this approach is that schemes for "formal encomium" much like Menander's were taught from the fourth century B.C.E. onwards, and that Hardie would have reached a similar picture of correspondences and modifications if he had used the scheme of Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.7.10–18) or any of the schemes in the writers of the so called *progymnasmata* (elementary exercises)[68]. So, if we suppose, for the sake of argument, that *Silvae* 2.6 does indeed show formal encomium[69], Hardie has only shown that Statius had received a standard rhetorical education (which is self-evident), but not that he had been taught a scheme for the *consolatio* or a similar genre. However, Hardie also adduces more specific correspondences between Statius' poem and the instructions Menander gives for his three funerary genres (the μονῳδία or complaint, the παραμυθητικός or consolation, and the ἐπιτάφιος or funeral speech): the reproach against the gods (*Silv.* 2.6.58–59, 69–79; Men. Rh. 435.9–14), the description of the death (79–85; 435.20–21) and of the funeral (85–93; 421.32–422.2). But these motifs were fixed elements of the tradition of Latin funerary poetry, and their presence in Statius proves nothing more than that Statius worked within that tradition[70].

Apart from his arguments for Statius' use of rhetorical theory, Hardie also introduces arguments which directly concern the existence of oratorical practice. With respect to consolations, he points to the consolatory decrees which are known from a number of Greek cities, including Naples, and which honour the memory of a meritorious citizen by granting a "public consolation" to his surviving relatives[71]. This does indeed look as if some ceremony took place (pre-

---

[68] See Russell and Wilson 1981: xi–xxix. Hardie 1983: 108 is wrong to claim that he has shown that "Statius was working from a particular formulation of the rhetorical encomium, *distinct in a number of ways from other formulations of the encomium* (my italics), which was current at his time and which later reappeared in Menander's epitaphios prescription."

[69] But note the reservations of van Dam 1988: 709.

[70] See Esteve-Forriol 1962: 138–39 (complaint against the gods), 140–44 (description of the death), 144–47 (description of the funeral).

[71] Cf. Hardie 1983: 3 with n. 15, 104 with n. 9.The Neapolitan decrees are *INapoli* 82, 83 (containing the formula παραμυθεῖσθαι δημοσίᾳ), and 85, all from

sumably in the theatre) at which an orator delivered a speech in the name of the city. Further, Hardie takes the report that the city of Naples (and many other cities as well) "congratulated" Pompey on his recovery from illness in 50 B.C.E. as evidence that "soteria" speeches were a traditional feature of Greek civic life[72]. Hardie further suggests (this time without specific reference to Naples) that the arrival and departure of Roman governors in Greek cities will have given occasion to speeches of welcome and leave-taking such as are treated by Menander Rhetor, who does indeed think of address to a governor (ἄρχων)[73].

It is important to realise that the types of speeches just mentioned (consolations, congratulations on recovery, speeches of welcome and leave-taking) stood in the context of Greek civic life: they were held by an orator who in the name of the city honoured a (potential) benefactor of the city before a large audience of fellow-citizens. This is also the picture we get from the prescriptions given by Menander for these types of speeches (in so far as he deals with them[74]): the speaker is continuously supposed to say "we" or "our city" and to make references to the present gathering, at times even directly speaking to the audience (or to parts of it)[75].

---

the second half of the first century A.D; they are discussed by Buresch 1894: 457–59 (see also Leiwo 1995: 133–42).

[72] Hardie 1983: 3 with nn. 13–14, 99. Cicero writes (*Tusc.* 1.86) *uulgo ex oppidis publice gratulabantur*, whereas Plutarch (*Pomp.* 57) only speaks of σωτήρια in the sense of sacrifices (cf. above, p. 271 with n. 52). Hardie could have adduced a more recent event: after Nero's alleged rescue from Agrippina *proxima Campaniae municipia uictimis et legationibus laetitiam testari* (Tac. *Ann.* 14.10.2).

[73] Hardie 1983: 99; cf. Men. Rh. 378.2–382.1, 414.31–418.4 (arrival), 395.20–32 (departure). Note, however, that Himerius (in the fourth century) seems to consider the προπεμπτικὸς λόγος as a new kind of speech (*Or.* 10.1 Colonna, quoted by Russell and Wilson 1981: 305).

[74] Menander discusses two types of speeches of welcome, the προσφωνητικός and the ἐπιβατήριος. In his treatment of the speech of leave-taking (προπεμπτικὴ λαλιά) he gives details only for the case that a student of rhetoric is taking leave of a fellow student. The instructions for the consolation (παραμυθητικός) are very short, and I will therefore also take into account the related μονῳδία and ἐπιτάφιος. Speeches on recovery are not dealt with at all (cf. above, p. 274 with n. 64).

[75] "We" and "our city": *passim* in the ἐπιβατήριος and the προσφωνητικός: 436.11–15 in the μονῳδία. References to the gathering: e.g. 378.30–31 and 381.6–13 in the ἐπιβατήριος; 435.22–23 in the μονῳδία. Address to the audience: e.g.

In the *Silvae* the situation is fundamentally different: here the context is Roman and the address is completely private. We have seen that the text of the poems often presupposes a context of utterance at the ceremony itself, but even so there is never any acknowledgement of a wider audience than the addressee. The only exception is the epithalamium for Stella and Violentilla (1.2), where Statius introduces his story of the courtship with the remark "his educated house knows how to listen" (50), but in this poem the context of utterance is fictional, as it is in many other poems. So in the central matter of the treatment of speech situation and audience Statius does not link up with the traditions of oratory and rhetoric. Moreover, even if some oratorical traditions had perhaps already emerged in first-century Campania, it is highly uncertain that the rhetorical traditions which have been adduced already existed. Thus there are two reasons, a systematical one and a historical one, to dissociate the *Silvae* from the kind of speeches described in the rhetorical handbook of Menander Rhetor. But that implies, I think, that one can no longer assume without argument, as is done by Hardie, that Statius wrote his *Silvae* for recitation to large audiences, such as were faced by the display orators of later Antiquity[76]. We need at least to consider another possibility.

Presentation in Writing

Until now, I have paid no attention to the non-imperial poems in Book 4, which in significant respects differ from the non-imperial poems in Books 1 through 3 and those published posthumously in Book 5. Not only are they generally closer to Late Republican and Augustan models (especially Horace), they also do not employ the deixis of a text meant for performance, but firmly present themselves as communications in writing. A brief survey will be enough to bring this out.

The first poem in Book 4 after the three compositions in honour of the emperor is a letter sent from Naples to Vitorius Marcellus in

3 in the ἐπιβατήριος; 435.22–23 in the μονῳδία. Address to the audience: e.g. 413.20 in the παραμυθητικός, 421.18–32 in the ἐπιτάφιος.

[76] Cf. Hardie 1983: 109.

Rome (4.4): Statius expressly characterises his composition as an *epistula* (4.*ep*.9, 4.4.*tit*., 1), and imitates the associative composition and informal style of Horace's *Epistles*[77]. The following poem, to Septimius Severus (4.5), takes up another Horatian genre, the lyric ode, but whereas in Horace the represented speech act is in general to be conceived of as oral (spoken or sung)[78], Statius' ode has the form of a letter sent from Alba, and begins with a paraphrase of the common formula of epistolary greeting (*Seuerum* ... *saluto*: 3–4)[79]. A third Horatian genre, the *sermo*, is evoked at the beginning of the poem for Novius Vindex (4.6): here we read a narrative, not directed at anybody in particular, which in retrospect tells of the occasion with which the poem deals. Then follows a second Horatian ode, congratulating Vibius Maximus on the birth of his child (4.7), which is even more clearly epistolary in character than the first, because Maximus dwells in Dalmatia. Next comes a piece addressed to Julius Menecrates (4.8), which is less closely indebted to Horace, although it does contain epistolary elements; Statius complains that he has heard the news of the birth of Menecrates' third child by common report, not from Menecrates himself, who is therefore not to be thought of as present when Statius makes his utterance[80]. The book is concluded by a Saturnalian composition in hendecasyllables (4.9), in the tradition of Catullus 14: this poem must have been sent to its addressee, Plotius Grypus, because Statius expresses his hope that Grypus will reciprocate with a substantial Saturnalian present and not "send back" hendecasyllables in his turn (*ne mihi* .. *hendecasyllabos remittas*: 54–55).

Of course it is possible that these poems, once they had been received by the addressee, were recited by him or by someone else (even by the poet) to some private audience, and this is even virtually certain for the poem to Plotius Grypus, which Statius characterises in the preface as "the hendecasyllables about which we laughed to-

[77] But there is also influence from Ov. *Pont*.

[78] Cf. Heinze 1923: 173–75 (and see Nauta 1994: 225–27 for problematisation).

[79] Similarly in *Silv*. 4.4.10–11.

[80] Statius calls the poem an *ecloga* (4.*ep*.19), as he does the poem to his wife (3.*ep*.20). This word did not denote a specific genre, but could be applied to any short poem; cf. e.g. Plin. *Ep*. 4.14.9, Suet. *Vit*. *Hor*. 46.12 Reiff., and see further Schröder 1999: 68–70.

gether at the Saturnalia" (4.*ep*.23–24). But none of these poems present themselves as specifically meant for recitation at the occasion they celebrate, and some of them (4.4, 4.5) even dispense with an occasion. In this they differ from the poems considered in the previous section, which are all constructed as a script for performance, even if that performance is a fiction. Yet these poems, too, were offered to their addressees in manuscript, as is evident from the remarks Statius makes in his prefaces[81].

When at the beginning of the preface to Book 1, Statius explains to Stella why he has decided to publish these poems (2), one of his arguments is that "it would be too late to hold them back, now that they are already in the possession of yourself and others in whose honour they were written" (10–11). In other contexts Statius uses the verbs *dare*, "to give" (2.*ep*.11, 4.*ep*.28; the latter with reference to poems for the emperor) and *tradere*, "to hand over" (1.*ep*.19, 2.*ep*.18; both with reference to the emperor)[82]. Giving is correlated with receiving, and Statius also writes that Claudius Etruscus "received" (*recepit*) the poem on his baths in the course of a dinner (1.*ep*.29–30). This poem was probably recited during the dinner in question[83], but with the verb "receive" Statius can hardly refer to hearing alone. In the context of the preface to Book 1 as a whole, he must mean that he also gave Etruscus the manuscript.

Now it has been argued in Chapter 2 that in Graeco-Roman Antiquity, giving a manuscript was equivalent to publishing it, at least if the gift was a real gift, i.e. if the giver relinquished his rights to determine what should be done with it: then *dare* amounted to *e-dere*[84]. So in a sense Statius had already published his poems, and the dividing line with their collective publication under a common title is a tenuous one. This is revealed in other aspects of his terminology as well. Thus, when he writes that is too late to keep his poems back, he uses the verb *continere*, which is a near-technical term for the deci-

---

[81] For the larger part of Book 5 there are no such remarks, because this book has no preface other than the letter accompanying 5.1.

[82] On poems offered in manuscript to the emperor see pp. 365–374.

[83] See above, p. 256.

[84] See p. 123.

sion not to publish a work one has ready[85]. Even more importantly, he refers to the individual poems as *libelli*, which implies that before being collected into the "book" (*liber*), they had been "little books" themselves[86]. The fourth poem in Book 1 is called "the *libellus* dedicated to Rutilius Gallicus" (1.*ep*.27), where Statius uses the same verb, *dedicare*, as he does for the dedication of Book 4 to Vitorius Marcellus (4.*ep*.1–2). And the verb *tradere*, "to hand over", which is used for the presentation of individual poems, also serves to offer Book 2 to Atedius Melior (2.*ep*.3). If the vocabulary for giving a poem and giving a book is that similar, one may well ask in what the difference consisted.

Dedication and Publication

It may be useful to repeat the words which Statius, at the beginning of the preface to Book 1, uses to describe his decision to bring out the *Silvae*:

> Diu multumque dubitaui, Stella ..., an hos libellos, qui mihi subito calore et quadam festinandi uoluptate fluxerunt, cum singuli de sinu meo pro***, congregatos ipse dimitterem. Quid enim *** quoque auctoritate editionis onerari, qui adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo? (1.*ep*.1–7)
>
> For a long time I have seriously hesitated, Stella, ..., what to do with these small texts, which flowed from me in the heat of the moment and with a kind of delight in rushing: now that individually they have escaped from my shelter, should I bring them out myself in collected form? For why should I burden myself with the responsibility for this publication as well, anxious as I still am for my *Thebaid*, although it has left my hands?

The first sentence is predicated on two contrasts: between *singuli* ("individually") and *congregatos* ("in collected form"), and between the idea of unintentionality or accidentality implied in the expression *de sinu meo pro**** ("escaped from my shelter"[87]) and the idea of

[85] Cf. e.g. Cic. *Att.* 327 SB (13.21a).1–2, Plin. *Ep.* 1.8.3 (*uel publicare uel continere*), 5.12.4 (*in continendo ... in edendo*), 9.25.3 (see p.157 with n. 43).

[86] *Liber*: 2.*ep*.4, 21, 3.*ep*.7, 4.*ep*. 1, 3, 10, 34; *libellus*: 1.*ep*.2, 16, 27, 2.*ep*.15, 3.*ep*.2, 11, 23; cf. White 1974: 44.

[87] Although the precise wording is in doubt, the meaning is not.

deliberate action implied in *ipse* ("myself"). The individual poems are already in the possession of their respective addressees, who can have them recited or copied if they like, but now Statius takes the responsibility for circulation upon himself. This seems also to be the point of the following sentence, although the lacuna causes uncertainty. The phrase *auctoritas editionis* could well mean "the responsibility for publication", with which Statius is burdening himself, although he still has fears for his *Thebaid*[88]. The responsibility is his because the act of collecting is his; hence the expression "bring them out myself in collected form". Out of individual *libelli* Statius has created a *liber* of the size published books normally were[89], equipped with a title of its own, and with an epistolary preface of its own.

Individual poems were sent with epistolary prefaces to their respective addressees, as we see from the letter preserved with *Silvae* 5.1. But the epistolary prefaces prefixed to Books 1 through 4 have an entirely different character, not only because they cover a number of poems, but also because they discuss literary questions raised by the publication of the book to which they belong (such as the question of the appropriateness of publication itself). The use of epistolary prose prefaces for literary apology and literary polemics was an established practice, as appears from the examples of the form in Martial, among which at least the preface to Book 2 is earlier than the beginning of the publication of the *Silvae*[90]. Moreover, in that

[88] I have translated <*oportet me huius*>, with the subsequent change of *quo* to *qui* (Baehrens, partly following Domitius), but without conviction. Other reconstructions suggest *hos* rather than *me* as the subject of *onerari*, e.g. Courtney's combination of earlier proposals <*opus eo tempore hos*> (without the need to change *quo*). Then the meaning would presumably be that the texts are burdened by the *prestige of* (rather than the *responsibility for*) publication.

[89] Books 1 through 4 all have around 800 lines, while the posthumously published Book 5, which is incompletely transmitted, must have had some 1000 lines at the least. These figures are average for books of poetry, as can be seen at a glance from the statistics of Birt 1882: 292–93. It must be noted, however, that much shorter works, such as the *Laus Pisonis* (less long than Stat. *Silv.* 5.3, 1.2, and 5.1, and only slightly longer than 2.1 and 3.3) seem to have circulated as independent books.

[90] Book 2 is from 86 or 87. The prose preface to Book 1, which is also an *epistula* (1.*ep.*13), although no epistolary formulas of salutation or valediction have been transmitted, probably belongs to a second edition of uncertain date; cf. Citroni 1975: xix–xxi, 3–7. The other epistolary prose prefaces occur in Books 8 (from 94), 9

preface Martial implies that the use of a letter was frequent, at least to accompany a tragedy or a comedy (Mart. 2.*ep*.3–4)[91]. Statius himself published a "letter" to Vibius Maximus "on the publication of the *Thebaid*" (4.*ep*.17–18), which may well have been written in prose and published together with the epic[92]. The letters introducing the *Silvae* likewise sometimes reflect on the process of publication.

At the end of the preface to the second book, addressed to Atedius Melior, Statius writes:

> Haec qualiacumque sunt, Melior carissime, si tibi non diplicuerint, a te publicum accipiant; si minus, ad me reuertantur. (2.*ep*.27–29)
>
> These pieces, whatever they are worth, my dearest Melior, if you do not dislike them, please make them publicly known; otherwise, let them return to me.

This means that Melior is expected to initiate publication of the book, if he sees fit, but if not, not[93]. Of course, Statius' uncertainty about Melior's decision is feigned; nevertheless, his request is no mere empty formula, but has to do with the specific structure of the dedication of books in Antiquity[94]. What Statius has done is to *give* a copy of his book to Melior, in such a way as to relinquish his rights

---

(from around 95), and 12 (from 101). On the publication dates of the *Silvae* see the Appendix.

[91] Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.31 reports that Pomponius Secundus and Seneca debated about stylistic questions *etiam praefationibus*, which is usually taken to refer to epistolary prose prefaces (cf. e.g. Janson 1964: 111). But because Quintilian introduces his report with *memini*, Cichorius 1922: 426–28 rightly argued that the word must here mean "spoken introduction to a recitation", as often (e.g. Mart. 3.18.1, Plin. *Ep.* 1.13.2, 5.12.3, and probably Suet. *Vit. Luc.* 50.6 Reiff.; cf. *ThLL* 10.2.601.13–22).

[92] The loss of such a preface in the transmission would not be surprising. Vollmer 1898: 14, Frère 1961: 1.xii and 2.133, n. 3*, and van Dam 1984: 16, n. 31 think that the letter was in verse.

[93] A close parallel is Plin. *Ep.* 9.25.3 (see p. 157): "you will bring my poems into circulation *si .. tibi placebunt; si* they don't please you, you will keep them to yourself". Among later prefatory texts one may compare e.g. Aus. *Praef.* (1 Green) 4.17 *ignoscenda teget, probata tradet*; *Cent. nupt.* (18 Green) *ep*.46–50 *si ..., sin aliter, ... redeant uersus unde uenerunt*; *Ludus* (24 Green) 18 *optabo ut placeam, si minus, ut lateam*; Sid. *Carm.* 3.7 *si probat, emittit, si damnat carmina, celat*; *Ep.* 5.17.11 *si placet, edentes fouete, si diplicet, delentes ignoscitote.*

[94] I here summarise the conclusions reached at pp. 120–131.

of possession: the verb he uses here is *tradere* (2.*ep*.3)[95]. So Melior does indeed have the right to do with the book as he likes, to initiate circulation or not. If he decides to have copies made, he will include the letter to himself, which thus will become part of the text of the book as published. For that reason Statius needs to compose the letter, which originally is only the dedication *of a copy*, in such a way that it can also stand as the dedication *of the work*. Accordingly, he includes information which is known to Melior, but which he deems necessary for the understanding of "the others" (*ceteri*), i.e. the readership at large (2.*ep*.9–10)[96]. So, the epistolary prose preface is to be connected not with the type of letter asking for corrections of a provisional draft, because such a letter does not, in principle, allow the recipient to publish the manuscript[97], but with the type of letter accompanying the gift of a finished text. Such a letter may (but need not) contain an explicit request to decide on publication[98].

Another type of request found in Statius' prefaces is that of defence against criticism. In the letter to Vitorius Marcellus which is prefixed to Book 4, Statius writes that he has heard that people have "censured" (*reprehenderunt*) his decision to publish the *Silvae* (25–27). He then, in a rather defiant manner, gives a number of reasons why he is not impressed, and concludes:

> Hunc tamen librum tu, Marcelle, defendes. Et, si videtur, hactenus, sin minus, reprehendemur. (34–35)
>
> Yet this book will be defended by you, Marcellus. And, if you agree to it, enough of this, if not, I will be censured.

The construction with *si ... sin minus ...* is exactly parallel to that at the end of Book 2[99], but the contents are different. The word *hactenus* is a common formula, very frequent in letters, to mark the end

---

95 Cf. the use of *mittere* at 3.*ep*.7 and of *dedicare* at 4.*ep*.1–2.

96 The same concern with the *ceteri* also occurs at 1.*ep*.11.

97 But cf. pp. 124–128.

98 This should be distinguished from requests to decide on publication made in letters which do not *give* the manuscript to the recipient (and therefore do not expect him to undertake publication himself), as in Plin. *Ep*. 1.8.18, 3.15.1, 5.12.4.

99 This disposes of Vollmer's transposition of *Sed* (for *Et*) *si uidetur, hactenus* before *Hunc tamen librum ...*

of the discussion of a topic ("enough of this")[100]. So Statius meaning is: "If you agree to defend my book, nothing more needs to be said, but if not ..."—and now Statius ends on the same note of defiance that he struck up earlier, using the same verb *reprehendere*: "indeed, I will be censured"[101]. We may compare a dedication poem from Martial, in which the poet tells his book that if it will be liked by Apollinaris, it will be safe against criticism, but if he condemns it, it will end up as waste paper[102]. Neither in Martial's nor in Statius' text is there a pretence that the dedicatee will decide upon publication: if he dislikes the book, it will nevertheless go out into the world, even though its fate will then be a harsher one. Probably both authors initiated circulation through the book trade independently of the mechanism of dedication[103].

From the criticisms that Statius had to endure because of the publication of the *Silvae* it appears that such publication was not self-evident. This was admitted by Statius himself from the start, when at the beginning of the preface to his first book, he said that he had long hesitated before taking the step. If he is to be taken at his word, the poems in the *Silvae* (at least those from Book 1) were written to function on an occasion, without publication being envisaged. Moreover, Statius does seem to have composed occasional poems that did not find their way into the published collection. In the consolation to Melior he writes (the passage has earlier been quoted for a different purpose):

---

[100] This disposes of the opinion of Markland 1827: 303 (followed by White 1973b: 279) that *hactenus* is to be glossed "nec ultra hujusmodi scripta edam", as well as of F.R.D. Goodyear's suggestion (*apud* Coleman 1988: 62) to read *defendes, si uidetur, hactenus*, deleting *et* and taking *hactenus* with *defendes*. The epistolary formula is often *sed haec hactenus* or *haec hactenus* or *sed hactenus* (cf. *ThLL* 6.2750.34–51), so that one might be tempted to change *Et* to *Haec* (with Phillimore) or rather to *Sed* (with Madvig and Vollmer).

[101] Not "we", as translated by Coleman 1988: 5. The plural form is chosen because *reprehendar* would give a bad clausula.

[102] Cf. also 7.26 (again to Apollinaris), where *sustentet* (6) parallels Statius' *defendes*, and 3.2, where the addressee (Faustinus) is asked to be the book's *uindex*. Poems like 7.72 and 10.33 are somewhat different, because there the criticisms the addressee is asked to answer do not concern the book offered to him.

[103] On the role of the book trade see p. 121.

me fulmine in ipso
audiuere patres; ego iuxta busta profusis
matribus at<que> piis cecini solacia natis
et mihi, cum proprios gemerem defectus ad ignes
(quem, Natura!) patrem (2.1.30–34)

to me fathers, still thunder-struck, have listened; I have sang consolations to mothers prostrate next to the pyre and to loving children, even to myself, when, shattered by a cremation of my own, I mourned (whom, o Nature!) my father.

In the *Siluae* as we have them, there are no poems consoling fathers or mothers, so that Statius must refer to unpublished compositions, just as the words on consoling himself on the loss of his own father refer to some version of what is now *Silvae* 5.3, a poem certainly not published during Statius' lifetime[104].

Another indication that the functioning of at least a number of the poems in Statius' *Silvae* was not dependent on subsequent publication is the long time interval that sometimes can be observed to have passed before publication occurred. Book 1 cannot have been published before 92[105], yet it contains two poems (1.2 and 1.5) which can be dated to 90 or 91[106]. Clearer cases are to be found in the following books: Book 2 contains a poem certainly dating from 90 (2.2), whereas Book 3, which cannot have been published before 94 (the date of 3.4) contains one poem from 91 (3.1) and another from 90 or 91 (3.2). But to determine these (and other) intervals more precisely, we need to know the exact publication dates of the individual books.

Since Vollmer's commentary of 1898 it has often been held that the first three books of the *Silvae* were published *en bloc*, like the first three books of Horace's *Odes* or of Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*[107]; if so, the date must be in 94[108]. One of the arguments ad-

---

[104] On *Silv.* 5.3 see pp. 195–198. Another reference to consolations for fathers and mothers is 5.5.38–39. One should not, however, deduce from 5.5.70 *genitali carmine foui* that Statius wrote a birthday poem for his *puer*, because the word *carmine* (although kept by Courtney) is certainly corrupt: see Håkanson 1969: 162–63, Delz 1992: 254–55.

[105] In his preface Statius mentions the death of Rutilius Gallicus (1.*ep.*28), which occurred in 92 (*ILS* 5025).

[106] On these dates and those mentioned below see the Appendix.

[107] See Vollmer 1898: 10–13. His theory is widely accepted, i.a. by Newmyer 1979: 46–49 and 56–57, Bright 1980: 53–54, Hardie 1983: 64–65, Coleman 1988:

duced for Vollmer's theory (if not by Vollmer himself)[109] is precisely the circumstance just noted, that Books 2 and 3 contain poems which are earlier than the publication of Book 1. Yet it cannot be excluded that Statius started publishing by issuing only Book 1, saving other poems for possible later books. It may be that he wanted to wait for reactions before going on. However—and this the second argument for Vollmer's theory—such reactions are not apparent until the preface of Book 4, and then they are negative. But again, the argument is not decisive: negative reactions may have been late in being formulated or being late in being perceived by Statius, or Statius may have chosen to ignore them until he could address his answer to Vitorius Marcellus, who seems to have been a person of some standing in Roman literary circles[110].

The way Statius addresses Vitorius Marcellus at the beginning of the preface was also used by Vollmer as an argument for his theory:

> Inueni librum, Marcelle carissime, quem pietati tuae dedicarem. Reor equidem aliter quam inuocato numine maximi imperatoris nullum opusculum meum coepisse; sed hic liber tres habet ***se quam quod quarta ad honorem tuum pertinet. (4.*ep.*1–5)
>
> I have found a book, my dearest Marcellus, that I may dedicate to your devotion. I do think that none of my small works has begun otherwise than with an invocation of the divine power of our greatest emperor, but this book has three *** than that the fourth is the one which honours you.

xvi and 55–56, and Laguna 1992: 8–10. The most notable opponent of the theory is Frère 1930 (cf. 1961: 1.xxi, 2.133, n. 2*), who is followed i.a. by van Dam 1984: 3 with n. 28 (cf. 1986: 2748).

108 Later than 3.4, which is from 94, and earlier than 4.1, on Domitian's seventeenth consulate, which is from the first days of 95, and would presumably have been included if it had existed.

109 But cf. Hardie 1983: 64, Coleman 1988: xvi, Laguna 1992: 9.

110 He was the dedicatee of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*. It does not follow, however, that the criticisms to which Statius refers are to be connected with Quintilian's criticisms either of orators who write rough drafts called *siluae* (10.3.17; cf. above, p. 252) or of improvised poetry (10.7.19, where Quintilian may be rather thinking of Remmius Palaemon, who according to Suetonius (*Gram.* 23) *poemata faciebat ex tempore*, and according to Schol. Juv. 6.452 had been Quintilian's teacher). On the contrary, if Quintilian had been among the critics, Statius would not have responded so flippantly in a published letter to the dedicatee of the *Institutio*; cf. Delarue 1974: 544–47.

Although the lacuna cannot be filled with certainty, there is no doubt that Statius explains to Marcellus that the poem addressed to him could only come fourth in the book, because the three poems to the emperor had to take precedence[111]. Statius' reasoning involves a comparison between the beginning of this *liber* ("book") and the beginning of his *opuscula* ("small works"). The word *opuscula* in itself might refer to single compositions (as it does 2.*ep*.3, 4.*ep*.23), but it is not true that all Statius' poems begin with praise of the emperor[112]. Moreover, Statius here talks about the way of beginning not a poem, but a collection, and it is more likely that that is the reference of *opusculum* here. Vollmer noted that, apart from the *Thebaid* and the *Achilleid*, Books 1–3 of the *Silvae* do indeed begin with honouring the emperor, but not Book 2 and Book 3 singly, and concluded that therefore Statius considered *Silvae* 1–3 as a single *opusculum*[113]. This seems correct, and is confirmed by the σφραγίς at the end of Book 3, which suggests that Statius considered his *Silvae* as finished; Book 4 was a new departure[114]. But even though Statius in retrospect regarded *Silvae* 1–3 as a unity, that does not imply that he had published the three books simultaneously. Indeed, for various reasons it is difficult to suppose that that was the case.

First, Statius writes that he has published the first book of the *Silvae* at a time when he "still" (1.*ep*.6) fears for his *Thebaid*. Because the *Thebaid* was published in 91 or 92[115], this ill fits a date in

111 One must supplement something along the lines of <*eclogas in laudem eius praepositas; uides igitur te magis honorari non potuis*>*se* (Coleman 1988: 56, after Vollmer 1898: 144).

112 But Frère 1930, changing *meum coepisse* to *me coepisse* (in 1961: 2.133 to *me incepisse*) thinks of spoken prayers preceding composition.

113 The word *opusculum* is sometimes used for a collection (e.g. Plin. *Ep*. 4.14.10), even for a work consisting of a number of books (e.g. Tert. *Adv. Marc*. 1.1, 2.1, 5.2), but nowhere else for an epic (cf. *ThLL* 9.2.862.25–863.24). But if Statius had written *operibus*, that would have not been in accordance with his general modesty about the *Silvae* (cf. in this preface 29–31).

114 See p. 195. *Silv*. 3.1 is written with reference to the beginning of the third books of Callimachus' *Aetia* and Virgil's *Georgics* (see Thomas 1983: 103–05, Newlands 1991), both works in four books, but the σφραγίς at the end of Book 3 and the innovative character of Book 4 in comparison with 1–3 tell against the conclusion that Statius likewise was planning a four-book work.

115 See p. 196, n. 8.

94, because then Statius' uncertainty must have lasted more than two years; a date in 92 seems much more likely. Secondly, in the preface to the third book, Statius writes, addressing Pollius Felix:

> Securus ... tertius hic Siluarum nostrarum liber ad te mittitur. Habuerat quidem et secundus <te> testem, sed hic habet auctorem (3.*ep*.7–8)
>
> Full of confidence this third book of my *Siluae* is sent to you. Certainly, already the second book had you as a witness, but this one has you as its guarantor.

The pluperfect *habuerat* (here, as often, used as a simple preterite) can hardly be interpreted differently than indicating the passage of time since the publication of the second book[116]. Thirdly, the third book is sent, i.e. dedicated, to Pollius, who is expected to take responsibility for it (but not for others); similarly, in the preface to Book 2, the decision to publish that book (but not others) was left to Melior[117]. The situation that each book has its own dedicatee is different from what we find in Horace's *Odes*, where there is no dedication of individual books, and in Ovid's *Epistulae ex Ponto*, where Brutus receives all three books at once (1.1.1–12)[118]. And fourthly, as we have seen at the beginning of this chapter, only from Book 2 onwards do we find poems which anticipate immortality for themselves; this suggests (even if it does not prove) that Statius began to reckon with publication only after he had made the experience of publishing Book 1[119].

---

[116] This was seen by Vollmer, who therefore qualified his theory in the sense that publication was only "etwa gleichzeitig", "in kurzen, wenn auch sehr kurzen Zwischenräumen" (1898: 13 with n. 2).

[117] In the preface to Book 1, Statius uses *testis* (or *testimonium*) with respect to his rapid composition, of which his addressees are "witnesses" (1.*ep*.16, 28, 29). In this sense, Pollius has witnessed 2.2 and may now witness 3.1. But in addition, he is prepared to guarantee (cf. *auctor*) the truth of Statius' claims for the other poems in Book 3 as well, because he is familiar with Statius' manner of writing (3.*ep*.1–6, partly quoted p. 250). This he will do by accepting the dedication and bringing the book into circulation. On sending as dedicating see pp. 120–124; on Melior p. 282.

[118] The *libelli* (1.1.3) sent to Brutus are not the individual poems, as in Statius, but the three books (making up the *opus*: 2), as appears from the plural in 5–12 (cf. the singular for a single book in *Tr.* 1.1 and 3.1) and from the fact that in Brutus' library they are to take the place of the *Artes* (12), i.e. the three books of the *Ars*.

[119] See pp. 254–255. It needs to be added that all of the poems in question are later than the publication of Book 1, if that took place in 92

So on balance, Vollmer's theory does not recommend itself, and we have to reckon with the publication of Book 1 in 92. Book 2 will then have appeared in 93, while Book 3 was not issued before 94[120]. But even if the intervals between composition and publication in some cases are not as long as they would have been if all three books were published in 94, the cases of 2.2 (from 90), 3.1 (from 91) and 3.2 (from 90 or 91) yield intervals of about three years, and there might be other such cases if we could date all poems. So for many poems their occasional character must have been paramount, even if from 92 onwards Statius may have anticipated subsequent publication of at least some of his occasional poetry.

To conclude this chapter, we may ask what difference publication would make with respect to the audience reached by the poems. Here we can only formulate probabilities, because we have very little direct evidence. We have seen that the publication of the *Silvae* was criticised, and this suggests that the work suscitated some interest in literary circles. It is to be doubted, however, that the work ever reached a really wide audience, as Martial's *Epigrams* did, which contained, apart from the celebrations of patrons, much skoptic, obscene, and jocular material, and were well adapted to reception at the symposium. Statius' compositions are longer and more serious (even if not free, at times, of a gentle humour), and maintain the orientation on the patron throughout. Of course their literary qualities could in principle grant them a reception among people who were not necessarily interested in the patrons, and such a reception seems occasionally to have occurred. Thus, a moving (if rather traditional) comparison in the consolation to Claudius Etruscus (3.3.128–30) was copied on a gravestone in the fourth century (*CLE* 1787.2–4). But the *Silvae* gained their greatest popularity among poets who had themselves occasion to write similar poetry, such as Ausonius, Claudian, and Sidonius Apollinaris, in other words the reception of the *Silvae* was largely motivated by their usefulness for a "productive reception"[121].

---

[120] The *terminus post quem* for Book 2 is the date of 2.7, probably October 92, or the date of 2.3, if that date is 93; the *terminus post quem* for Book 3 the date of 3.4, somewhere in 94.

[121] A short survey of the reception of the *Silvae* in Late Antiquity, with references to the literature on the subject, is offered by Laguna 1992: 34–36; cf. also Dewar 1996 on Venantius Fortunatus. On "productive reception" see Barner 1973.

And the situation is not much different after the *Silvae* had again been recovered in the fifteenth century: they became a major source of inspiration for occasional poetry, in Latin as well as in the vernacular, during the Renaissance and the Baroque periods[122].

[122] Cf. Adam 1988: 88–220.

CHAPTER SIX

FUNCTIONS OF STATIUS' *SILVAE*

Whenever a client pays homage to his patron by offering him a poem, the first function the poem is called upon to fulfil is precisely that of being an act of homage. Whatever its contents may be, the mere fact that it is offered expresses that the client is willing to accept his role as a client and to regard his patron as his patron. This in itself is a service rendered, because being a patron (which means being the superordinate in a lasting asymmetrical relationship) is prestigious as such. But a poem is no ordinary act of homage, it is a *literary* one, defining the patron as a *literary* patron. A literary (or, more broadly, a cultural) identity was important for many Roman gentlemen, and those who aspired to it could support their claims by having poetry written for them.

So it mattered to patrons *that* poetry was written for them; yet it also mattered to them *what* the poetry said. One thing the text of a poem might do was to reinforce and articulate the "message" already transmitted by the "medium", in other words to describe the identity of the patron as a man of letters. In the *Silvae*, a part of the contents of a poem is usually set aside for this purpose, as will be revealed by a rapid survey of the information Statius imparts about the literary interests of his patrons. Arruntius Stella, Manilius Vopiscus, Rutilius Gallicus, Pollius Felix, Septimius Severus, and Novius Vindex are all poets, and Argentaria Polla is the widow of one[1]. Atedius Melior, Maecius Celer, Vitorius Marcellus, Vibius Maximus, and Crispinus, if perhaps no practising poets, at least take a keen interest in the work of Statius and enjoy literary conversations[2]; Maximus, moreover, is a historian, and Gallicus, Marcellus, Severus, and Crispinus

[1] Stella: 1.2 *passim* (cf. 1.*ep*.1–2, 23); Vopiscus: 1.3.1, 23, 99–104; Gallicus: 1.4.19–37; Pollius: 2.2.9, 39–40, 69–70, 112–20, 3.1.65–6 (cf. 3.*ep*.5); Severus: 4.5.57–60; Vindex: 4.6.30, 98–108; Polla: 2.7 *passim* (cf. 2.*ep*.24–26).

[2] Melior: 2.*ep*.2; Celer: 3.2.142–43; Marcellus: 4.4.87–100 (in 46–49 it is explicitly said that he is no poet himself); Maximus: 4.7.21–28 (cf. 4.*ep*.15–18); Crispinus: 5.2.160–63 (cf. 71).

are practising orators, as are Flavius Ursus and Plotius Grypus[3]. The only ones missing out are Julius Menecrates, Claudius Etruscus (whose taste on the *artistic* side is, however, celebrated in 1.5), and the two imperial freedmen, Flavius Earinus (who is honoured more in function of his being the darling of the emperor than for his own sake), and Flavius Abascantus (whose post as *ab epistulis* in itself guarantees a literary identity[4]). But the function of asserting the literary identity of the patron is performed not only by explicit mention in specific parts of the poem, but also by all the literary features that the poem displays, because these honour the taste and judgement of the recipient.

What has been said up till now, both about the function of representing the patronage relationship in itself and about the function of representing the literary identity of the patron, may perhaps be rendered somewhat less abstract by the consideration of an example. I choose the propempticon (farewell poem) to Maecius Celer (3.2). Here we find effusive expressions of affection, as is usual in the genre, but also a clear acknowledgement of asymmetry: Statius calls Celer his *rex* (92), i.e. his patron, and contrasts his own role as a passive admirer (95) with the heroic activities of his patron[5]. Yet the poem transmits little in the way of hard information about Celer's career: not more than that he had been *tribunus laticlauius* in Syria in his youth (123–26), that he is now going to that province as a legionary legate (121–22), and that he hopes to be called to higher things (127–28)[6]. There was hardly more to be said, so that it is no wonder that by far the largest part of the poem consists of what may be called (somewhat irreverently) poetic trappings: there are almost fifty lines of invocation of the gods of the sea and the winds (1–49), almost twenty lines of complaint about the invention of navigation (61–78), more than twenty lines of prayer to Isis, the goddess of Celer's first destination, Egypt, who is asked to escort him to Syria

---

[3] Gallicus: 1.4.23–30, 71; Marcellus: 4.4.39–45, 64–65; Severus: 4.5.49–52; Crispinus: 5.1.98–110; Flavius Ursus: 2.6.95 (cf. p. 228, n. 126); Plotius Grypus: 4.9.14–16.

[4] On the qualifications of the *ab epistulis* cf. Millar 1992: 85–93. Birley 1992: 41–54 stresses a more military role, especially with respect to promotions.

[5] Cf. p. 237 on affection in the propempticon, and p. 16 on the meaning of *rex*.

[6] On Celer's career see p. 213.

(101–126), and about fifteen lines of anticipation of the happy return, with a resounding enumeration of the oriental sights about which Celer will report (127–43). All these elements were traditional in the genre[7], and Statius here gives a virtuoso display of what he can do in the propempticon. But by the same token the poem is also a compliment to Celer's literary learning and judgement, and by this Celer is honoured as much as, or perhaps more than, by the brief description of his respectable, but otherwise unspectacular career.

In *Silvae* 3.2, the two standard functions of representing the patronage relationship and representing the literary identity are the dominant ones. However, in many other poems other functions are important, which can only be disclosed by an analysis of context and content. An important factor is the original reception situation, and, bound up with that, the original audience. It makes a difference, e.g., whether a poem is recited to the guests at a symposium or the attendants at a ceremony, or whether it is offered to the patron in private. These matters have been discussed at length in Chapter 5, and we may now briefly consider what the conclusions there provisionally reached entail for the question of function.

Two poems were identified which were probably recited at a symposium: 1.5, on the baths of Claudius Etruscus, and 4.6 (in an earlier version, without the narrative introduction), on a statuette of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex; moreover, it was suggested that also 1.3, on the villa of Manilius Vopiscus, 2.2, on the villa of Pollius Felix, 3.1, on a temple erected on the precincts of that villa, and perhaps 2.3 on a tree in the garden of the town house of Atedius Melior, might have been recited at a symposium during the poet's stay at the villa or town house concerned[8]. At a symposium, the mere fact that a poet performs already expresses the literary identity of the host. It is interesting that both for the poem on Etruscus' baths and

---

[7] Most of these motifs occur in Statius' two main models, Hor. *Carm.* 1.3 and Ov. *Am.* 2.11: invocation of the gods of the sea and the winds (Hor. 1–4, Ov. 34–36), complaint about the invention of navigation (Hor. 9–40, Ov. 1–6), anticipation of happy return (Ov. 37–56). The description of travels at the place(s) of destination occurs e.g. in Cinna fr. 1 and 4 Courtney (1993: 214–17) = fr. 1 and 5 *FPL*[3] (219–20) and in Prop. 1.6.31–34. For a more detailed discussion of these and other connections see Hardie 1983: 156–64, Laguna 1992: 191–239 (esp. 194–98).

[8] See pp. 256–257.

for that on Vindex' statuette we have parallel compositions by Martial (6.42 and 9.43–44, respectively), because this suggests that not a single poet was invited to perform, but a number of them. In the context of the self-presentation of Etruscus or Vindex, poetry was in a sense a luxury good, like the baths or the statuette itself, and was subject to be judged by its quantity as well as by its quality[9]. But not only the act of performance, also the contents of the poetry were relevant. In the case of descriptions of buildings or works of art, the contents consisted for the most part in a verbal articulation of the signs already emitted visually by the surroundings or by the objects on display. Such a verbal articulation can never be a neutral reproduction, because it always involves an interpretation of the visual signs: therefore the poem imposes that interpretation upon the audience. Below, I will try to find out what specific messages were conveyed by the poems for Etruscus, Vindex, Vopiscus, and Pollius Felix.

In the case of what one may call Statius' "ceremonial" poems (the wedding poem 1.2, the poem on recovery from illness 1.4, the funeral poems 2.1, 2.6, 3.3, and 5.1, the birthday poem 2.7, the poems on departure 3.2 and 5.2, the dedication 3.4), the conclusion was reached in Chapter 5 that they were probably not performed at the occasion they celebrate, but seem to have been offered to the patron in manuscript[10]. Yet this does not imply that such poems reached no audience but the addressee himself. The fact that the poem was *given* meant that the recipient could make it known in any way he pleased: he might have it recited or he might distribute copies among his friends[11]. Whether this would fulfil a meaningful function for him of course depended on the contents of the poem. Therefore, an analysis of contents may reveal possible functions, and these in their turn may allow inferences about possible modes of reception. E.g., if a poem obviously tries to combat criticisms voiced against the addressee, one may suspect that that poem was intended to influence the opinions of others about that addressee. In such a case, some kind of

[9] And quantity may be more easily increased than quality: according to the *Historia Augusta*, no fewer than one hundred poets performed epithalamia at a royal wedding organised by the emperor Gallienus (SHA, *Gall.* 11.7).

[10] See pp. 259–269, 279.

[11] See pp. 120–124.

wider reception may be assumed, even if it cannot be independently proved.

In what follows I will attempt to show that an attentive (and somewhat distrustful) interpretation of the poems in the *Silvae* often reveals that the position of the patron was in some way contested, in such a way that Statius' text can be construed as a defence. In these cases we may speak of the function of apology. Moreover, it sometimes seems that Statius tries to further his patron's ambitions by making them more widely known, and in those cases we may speak of the function of advertisement. A separate section will be devoted to those among Statius' patrons who had withdrawn from public life, because here the choice of existence itself had to be legitimated, and wealth and culture took the place of military or political achievements.

Apology and Advertisement

Silvae 1.2 is an epithalamium on the wedding of Arruntius Stella with Violentilla. The larger part of the poem is taken up by an epic-style narrative (featuring Venus and her sons, the Amores) about Stella's courtship, which Statius represents as having been long and arduous. The reason that Violentilla hesitated to accept Stella's suit was that she was a widow, who still mourned her first husband (138–39). But finally Venus decided to intervene, and exhorted Violentilla in a speech strongly reminiscent of the words addressed to the most famous widow in Latin literature, Virgil's Dido, by her sister Anna[12]: Violentilla should not overdo her faithfulness (*fides*: 164) to her dead husband, and after having rejected many suitors, should now give in to Stella. She then does indeed yield, impressed by the love poetry Stella has addressed to her (193–200).

[12] Cf. *Silv.* 1.2.162–70 with Verg. *A.* 4.31–38. For the reminiscences (not sufficiently noted in the commentaries) cf. Laguna 1994, esp. 270–74, P. Watson 1999: 352, 353, n. 23.

Violentilla may well have become a widow very soon after her first marriage, as she does not seem to have had children[13]. Because Roman girls normally married in their late teens, this implies that she may have been still young[14]. Moreover, she was very beautiful, as Statius repeatedly asserts (107–20, 167–68, 263, 273–77). Now—to vary a dictum of Dr Johnson—in epithalamia a man is not upon oath, but one may think that Statius' description is confirmed by Stella's passion and poetry. In any case there is little reason to doubt Statius' further praises, concerning Violentilla's high birth (108–09) and great wealth (121–29, 146–57), because these matters must have been common knowledge[15]. Clearly, Violentilla was a good match.

It was no objection that she was a widow. In spite of what is sometimes believed, the remarriage of widows was not only perfectly acceptable, but even encouraged in women of child-bearing age[16]. Yet the marriage had attracted negative comments, if for other reasons. Statius reacts to this at the very beginning of his poem, immediately after having proclaimed the wedding day:

> Cedant curaeque metusque,
> cessent mendaces obliqui carminis astus,
> fama tace: subiit leges et frena momordit
> ille solutus amor, consumpta est fabula uulgi
> et narrata diu uiderunt oscula ciues. (26–30)

> Yield, cares and fears, cease, mendacious wiles of allusive poetry, be silent, rumour: that unfettered love has submitted to the laws and accepted the bridle, the talk of the town has been fulfilled, and the people have seen the kisses that had so long be a story.

It is sometimes supposed that the "rumour" was about sexual relations of Stella with other women, but that cannot be the meaning

---

[13] Her childlessness is inferred by Vollmer 1898: 250 from verse 270, where Statius addresses the expected child of the union with Stella: *tuque ipse parenti/ parce, puer, ne mollem uterum, ne stantia laedas/pectora* (269–71).

[14] Saller 1994: 25–41 concludes that the mean age was around 20, but that it was lower in the aristocracy. See also Krause 1994: 21–34.

[15] On Violentilla's wealth and background see Sartori 1985: 207–14.

[16] See Humbert 1972: 1–180, and more briefly Krause 1994: 102–07. Both Statius himself and the emperor Domitian were second husbands (*Silv.* 3.5.50–59; Suet. *Dom.* 1.3, D.C. 66.3.4), as was Flavius Abascantus (*Silv.* 5.1.45–46) (and probably Pollius Felix: see pp. 223–225).

here[17]. The "rumour" must be the same as the "talk of the town" which has now come true—the connection is underlined by etymological play between *fama* and *fabula*—, and the contrast is between "a story" and "have seen": the same love that formerly was only a matter of gossip is now visible to all.

This interpretation can be supported by Martial's epigram on the occasion of the marriage (6.21), which takes up the narrative about Venus in Statius' poem, but gives it a less decorous turn[18]. Venus is here described as actually joining Stella and Violentilla in wedlock, and speaking some formal words of commendation. But she adds a whispered warning to Stella not to be unfaithful, and adduces as an example her own marriage with Mars: before they were formally married, Mars had often roamed free, but after their union had been ratified, he had not betrayed her with any mistress[19]. The analogy obviously implies that Stella had indeed had affairs with other women, and this is certainly the point of Martial's teasing. But there is the further implication that Stella and Violentilla, like Mars and Venus, had been lovers already before their marriage, and this is what Statius is concerned with.

Martial also helps to determine how long the affair had been going on. From another epigram (7.14) we learn that Stella's famous poem on the death of a dove, also mentioned by Statius (102), concerned a dove of Violentilla[20]; because Martial further compares this poem with Catullus' poem on Lesbia's sparrow, we may presume that Violentilla was Stella's mistress, as Lesbia was Catullus'. Now the poem on the dove is already mentioned by Martial in Book 1

---

17 Cf. Vollmer 1898: 241, Frère 1961: 1.20, n. 1*. Against: Vessey 1972: 181, n. 3, P. Watson 1999: 350–51.

18 That Martial reacts to Statius is generally agreed: e.g. Grewing 1997: 176–77, Henriksén 1998: 91–94, P. Watson 1999

19 Martial's idea that Venus and Mars eventually got married (which is also present in 6.13) may have been inspired by Statius, who calls Venus Mars' *maritus* (53), although formerly (*quondam*) she had been caught in adultery with him (59–60). But Ovid already calls Mars Cupid's *uitricus* (*Am.* 1.2.24, 2.9.47–48. *Rem.* 27); he is followed by Apul. *Met.* 5.30.1.

20 Martial here and elsewhere calls her *Ianthis*, playing with a (false) etymology of *Violentilla* from *uiola*, in Greek ἴανθος or ἴανθον. Stella himself apparently called her *Asteris* (cf. *Silv.* 1.2.197–98), from ἀστήρ, the Greek for *stella*, rather than using a metrical equivalent of *Violentilla*, which would have been too cumbersome.

(1.7), and this dates the beginning of the affair to before 85–86. The wedding, on the other hand, must have taken place at the time of Martial's Book 6, i.e. in 90 or 91, and can be more precisely dated to the beginning of that period, because Violentilla is represented as agreeing to the marriage (199–200) at a time when the triumph over the Dacians, which took place in the autumn of 89, is still in the future (180–81). So the affair must have lasted at least five years[21], and this only makes the question more urgent why Statius felt the need to combat what he represents as slanderous innuendo.

The answer is found in the immediate sequel to the lines just quoted, where Statius addresses Stella and tells him that Violentilla is now his, that he may cross her threshold openly, "because no longer is there anywhere a doorkeeper or a law or shame" (35–36). The "law" (*lex*) can only be the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*, the Julian law (because originally proposed by Augustus) on the control of adultery, which had long been left dormant, but was being reawakened by Domitian just around this time: the re-introduction of the law is repeatedly mentioned by Martial in his sixth book, the same book in which the epigram on Stella's wedding was published[22]. This law did not only cover married women, it also covered widows[23]. The most explicit statement is in the *Institutiones* of Justinian:

> lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis, quae non solum temeratores alienarum nuptiarum .. punit ... eadem lege Iulia etiam stupri flagitium punitur, cum quis sine ui uel uirginem uel uiduam honeste uiuentem stuprauerit. (*Inst.* 4.18.4)
>
> the Julian law on controlling adultery, which not only punishes those who desecrate the marriages of others ... by the same Julian law the

[21] The reasoning does not hold if 1.7 is from the later second edition of Book 1, but one may remark that Statius, who presents the affair as an unsuccessful courtship (see below), has Amor say: *longos iussi sperare per annos* (78).

[22] See Mart. 6.2, 4, 7, 22, 45, 91, and probably already 5.75, which suggests that the re-introduction took place at the end of 89. Statius mentions a trial under the *lex Iulia* a few years later, at 5.2.99–110. Cf. also Juv. 2.30–31, Suet. *Dom.* 8.3, and D.C. 67.12.1.

[23] The law is known mainly from *D.* 48.5; cf. *RSt* 2.781–786. For further discussion see esp. Treggiari 1991: 277–98 (esp. 278–80), Mette-Dittmann 1991: 33–130 (esp. 34–35 and 40–42), and McGinn 1998: 106–20, 140–247 (esp. 150–51).

crime of *stuprum* is also punished, when someone debauches without force either a virgin or a widow who lives respectably.

Here a distinction is made between *adulterium*, committed with married women, and *stuprum*, committed with virgins or widows[24]. But the offence with respect to a widow could also be covered under *adulterium*, because widows were explicitly put on the same level as married women[25]. Thus when Quintilian, writing after the reintroduction of the *lex Iulia*, discusses the case of a woman who gives birth after a year's widowhood, the crime she stands convicted of is *adulterium*, not *stuprum* (Quint. *Inst.* 5.13.9). So it is understandable that the jurists complain that the *lex Iulia* did not clearly distinguish between *stuprum* and *adulterium*[26]. But for the present argument the conceptual confusion hardly matters, because there can be no doubt that the law covered widows, under whatever heading.

So it looks as if Stella and Violentilla married because their affair, which had not been offensive before Domitian started his moral reform, was now liable to punishment by law[27]. And it may be a sly joke on Martial's part that in his published Book 6, immediately after his epigram on the wedding, he put one of his comments on the *lex Iulia*:

Quod nubis, Proculina, concubino
et, moechum modo, nunc facis maritum,
ne lex Iulia te notare possit:
non nubis, Proculina, sed fateris. (6.22)

You marry your consort, Proculina, and make your former lover into your present husband, so that the Julian law can't write you down. That's not marrying, Proculina, it's confessing.

---

[24] Similarly *D.* 48.5.35 (34).1 (Mod.) and the texts mentioned in n. 26.

[25] See *D.* 48.5.11 (10).*pr.* (Papin.); cf. 50.16.46.1 (Ulp.).

[26] See *D.* 48.5.6.1 (Papin.), 50.16.101.*pr.* (Mod.).

[27] This suggestion was already made by Veyne 1983: 8 = 1991: 62–63 with n. 25; cf. also Veyne 1985: 85, 172. The dating fits very well: the *lex Julia* was renewed at the end of 89 (n. 22), and the marriage took place at the beginning of 90, as was argued above on independent grounds. A further confirmation can perhaps be found in Juvenal, who refers to the *lex Iulia* with the words *leges amaras/ ... ipsis Veneri Martique timendas* (2.30–31). Might he have been thinking of the role of Venus and Mars in Mart. 6.21?

Neither the word *concubinus* ("consort") nor the word *moechus* ("lover") imply that Proculina was married to another before complying with the *lex Iulia*, and her situation is more easily understood as resembling that of Violentilla[28]. So perhaps, after teasing the groom, Martial also teased the bride. This epigram may well have been not so very unlike the "mendacious wiles of allusive poetry" (27) that Statius wants to silence.

Statius' tactic is twofold. First, he denies that the affair was ever consummated, and to that end he ingenuously takes the elegiac love poet Stella at his word. We have already seen that he tells Stella that there is no longer a "doorkeeper" to bar access to Violentilla (35), and this suggests that Stella had written an elegy on the lines of Ovid's address to his mistress' doorkeeper (*Am.* 1.6). Statius further mentions the doorstep (34), the nights spent outside the beloved's house (37, 196), the lover's sighs (33), gifts (195), pleas (195), and tears (196), and his reproach that the beloved is "unyielding" (*dura*: 200). These are all motifs of the so-called *paraclausithyron* or *komos*, the lover's complaint outside the beloved's closed door, and by taking these motifs quite literally, Statius not only vindicates the innocence of Stella's love-life, but also his identity as an elegiac poet[29].

Secondly, Statius stresses Stella's political career, in order to leave no doubt that Stella is a faithful and favoured servant of Domitian and would not be a person to make light of the emperor's laws. In this respect Statius does not confine himself to the successes already obtained by Stella (174–81), but also predicts that he will soon be granted a consulate before the regular date (175–76)[30]. Just as Statius' stress on Stella's innocence with respect to the *lex Iulia* may have been motivated by the wish to placate the possible ire of Domi-

---

[28] Against Grewing 1997: 186. In the only other passage where *concubinus* means the partner of a woman rather than a man, the woman is a divorcee (Tac. *Ann.* 13.21.3). *Moechus*, is the non-juridical equivalent of *adulter* (Treggiari 1991: 263), and can be used when the relationship qualifies as *adulterium*, whether the woman is married or not.

[29] For this strategy cf. P. Watson 1999: 353–355, for the motifs from the *paraclausithyron* Pederzani 1995: 52, 116. A similar case of taking literally motifs from Stella's poetry is 95–99 (*recusatio*; cf. Pederzani 1995: 77–78).

[30] On Stella's career see pp. 211–212.

tian, so this advertisement of Stella's ambitions may also have been meant for the emperor's ears. If so, a wider reception must have been anticipated.

Stella is not the only one whose future advancement is sung by Statius. Maecius Celer, who has just been appointed as a legionary legate, is expected to be recalled by Domitian in order to receive the consulate (3.2.127–28).

Vitorius Marcellus, a praetorian like Celer, has not yet become a legionary legate, but Statius stresses that he has the requisite military qualities (4.4.61–69) and will give *exempla* to his young son Geta, in order that the latter may equate the achievements of his maternal grandfather, who was a patrician and had received the triumphal insignia (70–73)[31]. High expectations are also entertained of the children of Julius Menecrates, who is a Roman knight himself, but of whose sons it is hoped that the emperor's favour will grant them admission to the senate (4.8.59–62)[32].

These passages may perhaps all be explained as flattery of the addressee, not as veiled requests to the emperor, but the situation is somewhat different in the case of the consolation to Flavius Abascantus on the death of his wife Priscilla (*Silv.* 5.1)[33]. The poem was written a year after the event, and a suspicion arises that it was ordered by Abascantus for another purpose than that of merely being consoled[34]. Perhaps such a purpose may be divined[35]. Suetonius reports that Domitian "shared some of the highest offices between freedmen and Roman knights" (*Dom.* 7.2), which must mean that he placed some of the Palatine bureaux, until then headed by an imperial freedman, under the joint direction of a freedman and a knight[36]. We have evidence for this precisely in the case of the department of

[31] On Marcellus' career and family see pp. 213–213.

[32] On Julius Mencrates see p. 221.

[33] On Abascantus see p. 233.

[34] See p. 247.

[35] The following interpretation is dependent on Hardie 1983: 185–87, but with correction of details of prosopography and administrative history.

[36] Suetonius' phrase (*quaedam ex maximis officiis inter libertinos equitesque Romanos communicauit*) is discussed by Weaver 1994: 355–58. On the gradual replacement of freedmen by knights as heads of the Palatine bureaux see the references at p. 342, n. 60.

ab epistulis, because the equestrian Titinius Capito is attested as its head at the end of the reign of Domitian[37]. So Abascantus was robbed of his sole responsibility, and we cannot even exclude that he lost his job altogether, perhaps as a result of Domitian's growing suspicions of his freedmen generally[38]. Abascantus' position seems to have been at least threatened, and the heavy emphasis put by Statius on his intellectual and moral qualities (e.g. 76–79) and especially on his unbounded loyalty to the emperor (e.g. 207–08, 239–46) may well be part of a defensive strategy.

In this context attention should also be paid to Priscilla's tomb, which Statius describes at length (222–46). It was in the form of a temple, and contained statues of Priscilla in the guise of Ceres, Venus, and other goddesses[39]. This type of statue, in which a human portrait head was attached to a standard representation of a deity, originated within the imperial family. Thus, after the death of Julia, the niece of Domitian, her portrait was combined with a sculptural group of Venus and Amor (Mart. 6.13)[40]. But the Roman aristocracy did not follow the practise, which was generally criticised, also by Statius himself when writing for the widow of a senator (2.7.124–27). He is therefore bound to offer some kind of apology, and he does so in stating that the goddesses were not loath to accept Priscilla's beautiful features (234–35). But he also gives a far more powerful explanation: the entire grave monument copies, on a smaller scale, the *Templum Gentis Flauiae* that Domitian had built for the mortal remains of the deified members of his family[41]. Statius claims that Abascantus, by braving the strictures of aristocratic taste in order to imitate his imperial master, had shown himself a true servant of Domitian (239–46). But if the reconstruction given above is correct,

[37] He was *iterum ab epistulis* under Nerva and *ab epistulis tertio* under Trajan: *CIL* 6.798 = *ILS* 1448 and *AE* 1934, 154; cf. Pflaum 1960–61: 1.143–45, *PIR*² O 62.

[38] Hardie 1983: 185 supposes that he was demoted to the position of *a cognitionibus*, identifying him with the Abascantus of *CIL* 6.8628 = *ILS* 1679, but this has been refuted by Weaver 1994 (who supposes that Abascantus remained in office alongside Capito). For Domitian's mistrust of his freedmen (some of whom were eventually to murder him) see Suet. *Dom.* 14.4, D.C. 67.14.4.

[39] On this temple and its backgrounds see Wrede 1981: 75–77, 81–84, 93–105.

[40] Already Nero's wife Poppaea was deified as Venus: D.C. 63.26.4.

[41] On the *Templum Gentis Flauiae* see Darwall-Smith 1996: 159–65 and Davies 2000: 24–27, 148–58.

neither Abascantus' gesture nor Statius' interpretation of it were successful in changing Domitian's mind.

Silvae 5.1 is in some respects reminiscent of another poem celebrating the career of an imperial freedman who had risen to one of the highest posts in the imperial bureaucracy: this is *Silvae* 3.3, the consolation to Claudius Etruscus on the death of his father, the former *a rationibus*. Both poems are consolations, but in 3.3 the great imperial freedman is not the mourner (as in 5.1), but the deceased. This entails that a more systematic account of his life and achievements must be given than in the other poem. Such an account would normally begin with the family background and the birth of the person praised, but in the case of a freedman this caused obvious difficulties. In other poems on slaves and freedmen Statius chose other solutions, but here he adapted his treatment to the identity of his subject as an imperial bureaucrat[42]. Statius shifts the emphasis from birth to the serving relationship, which he puts in the perspective of Stoic cosmology: no shame attaches to being a servant of the emperor, because the entire universe is governed by a law of obedience (49). Foreign peoples serve kings, kings Rome, Rome the imperial family, the imperial family the gods, the gods Fate (43–55)[43]. In this manner, Statius legitimises at the same time both the status of the father of Claudius Etruscus and imperial authority as such.

Once, however, the obedient servant had incurred the displeasure of his exalted taskmaster, and the consequences had been dramatic: he had been dismissed from his job, and sent into exile. Statius could not well pass over this episode, not only because it must have been generally known, but also because the father of Claudius Etruscus had been pardoned, so that an expression of gratitude in Etruscus' name was necessary (cf. 154–55)[44]. Therefore Statius does describe the events, but puts as favourable a construction upon them as he may: the fault had been venial, a mere lapse of attention in old age; the penalty had been mild, relegation to pleasant Campania (whereas

---

[42] See Lotito 1974–75: 301–12, and cf. below, pp. 304–307, on the other poems.

[43] On the Stoic background see Lotito (as in the previous note) and Laguna 1996: 248–49.

[44] Martial had written an epigram of thanks: 6.83.

an assistant had had to leave Italy), and the imperial wrath had soon subsided (156–67). In reality, as the discussion of the career of the father of Claudius Etruscus in Chapter 4 has revealed, the cause of the banishment had been a conflict with the emperor over monetary policy; the lighter form of punishment had been granted out of consideration for the influential family of Claudius Etruscus' mother; and the exile had lasted from about 83 to 90 or 91, full seven years[45]. But Statius underplays the seriousness both of the conflict and of the penalty, in order to exalt Domain's clemency (cf. 167–71).

An entirely different type of imperial freedman is represented by Earinus, the young eunuch who was Domitian's favourite cupbearer (3.4). Here too a problem of justification arose: Domitian could be accused of hypocrisy because he had forbidden castration, yet himself loved an eunuch (born before his decree). But this will better be discussed in the part of the book devoted to imperial patronage; at this point it is more fitting to concentrate on the slave or freedman boys of non-imperial patrons, and to return to the treatment of (ex-)slave status in the *Silvae*.

Such *pueri*, as I will henceforth call these boys[46], are celebrated by Statius in three funerary poems: 2.1, for Atedius Melior on the loss of his *puer* Glaucias; 2.6, for Flavius Ursus on the loss of his *puer* Philetas; and the incompletely transmitted (or unfinished) poem 5.5, on his own *puer* (who is not named)[47]. As in the poem to Earinus, the principal topic of praise of the boy is beauty (cf. 2.1.41–54, 106–13, 154–57; 2.6.21–47, 71–75), although mental and moral qualities are not forgotten (2.1.56–69, 113–19; 2.6.48–57). Such *pueri* formed part of the display of good taste and generous wealth of the master: they were apparelled in precious robes (2.1.128–36; cf. 3.4.50–55) and offered to the admiration of guests at dinner-parties

---

45 See p. 231.

46 It is difficult to find a term which will cover the complex (and not always easily determinable or understandable) relationships between boy and master. "Slave boy" does not fit, because both Melior's Glaucias and Statius' own *puer* were freed at birth (cf. Mart. 6.28.1–3, 6.29.3–4 and *Silv.* 5.5.73–77 respectively). The word *delicatus*, which occurs in the *tituli* of 2.1 and 2.6, may be a later addition (see van Dam 1984: 72–73). So the non-committal *puer* seems best.

47 A tabellaric survey of the information Statius provides about these three boys and about Earinus is to be found in Cancik-Lindemaier and Cancik 1982: 42–44.

(2.1.60–61, 68). When they died, the display was continued by a sumptuous funeral at which no costs were spared (2.1.157–65, 2.6.85–93). This is not to suggest that the master's sorrow was not sincere: display demands that mourning should be ostentatious, commensurate with one's wealth and status, not that it should be insincere.

The cult of *pueri* in Early Imperial Rome had at least two components. First there is the erotic aspect, which is hinted at in the names of Glaucias and Philetas, and is reflected by Statius in the use of words like *amare* and *amor*, although he strenuously excludes a sexual dimension and emphasises the boys' *pudor* ("decency") and *uerecundia* ("modesty")[48]. On the other hand the affection could be more of a paternal nature, and the *pueri* offer a solace for childlessness[49]. Yet affection for someone of non-free descent, although increasingly acceptable in Early Imperial Rome, was still not generally approved of: both before and after Statius dissenting voices are reported[50]. Statius himself anticipates criticisms (2.6.1–20; cf. 5.5.56–65), and to counter these he explicitly defends his patrons' attitude: in 2.1 he argues that the love between foster-children and foster-parents may be as deep, nay deeper, than love based on ties of the blood (82–105), and in 2.6 he discusses slavery as such, appealing to enlightened notions of *humanitas* (8–20): the initial *famulum gemis*, "you mourn a slave" (10) becomes, through a series of modulations, *hominem gemis*, "you mourn a human being" (14)[51]. So here we can well see that poetry can have functions for its patrons by trying to influence the mentality of its audience.

---

[48] *Amare*: 2.1.56, 105, 2.6.105 (where *amari* is better than *amorem*, in spite of van Dam 1984: 449); *amor*: 2.1.207 (cf. 3.4.38); *pudor*, *uerecundia*, etc.: 2.1.40, 72–75, 136; 2.6.38–40 (cf. 3.4.16–19).

[49] This was important for Melior (cf. 2.1.81 *genuisse putauit* and other passages discussed by van Dam 1984: 68) and for Statius himself (cf. 5.5.10–17: *non de stirpe quidem*, etc., 69–72, 79–87), but not, apparently, for Flavius Ursus. Veyne 1985: 89–91 suggests that beloved *pueri* were generally illegitimate children with slave women, but although this may have been true in other cases, it was obviously not true for Glaucias or for Statius' own *puer*, nor for Philetas (see 2.6.21, 99–100).

[50] Cf. the apologetic attitude of Seneca in *Ep.* 47 and of Pliny in *Ep.* 8.16.3; see further Citroni 1975: 271–73.

[51] Cf. van Dam 1984: 68 (on 2.1) and 393–34 (on 2.6); for *humanitas* see Rieks 1967 (223–24, n. 53 on the *Silvae*).

The mentality about birth plays a role not only in the poems on slaves and freedmen, but also in the lyrical ode to Septimius Severus (4.5), a rich (17–20, 53–56) and cultured (57–60) Roman knight (41–44)—but of African extraction. Statius begins with describing his own existence in Horatian colours (1–20), adroitly manages the transition to his addressee (21–28), but then rather abruptly asks: "Did pathless Lepcis, amid the remote Syrtes, give birth to you?" (29–30). The question is the introduction to five stanzas (29–48), in which Statius asserts that Severus, although an African, could vie in all respects with the Roman aristocracy: "Your speech is not Punic, nor your behaviour, you have no foreign mind: an Italian, an Italian![52]. Statius' emphasis is comprehensible if one realises that in the same Book 4 he twice speaks in strongly negative terms of the Punic leader Hannibal (4.3.4–6, 4.6.75–84), remembrances of whom were at the same time being revived in Silius Italicus' epic the *Punica*[53]. Moreover, there is some evidence that Domitian himself was not favourable to Africans. In the few surviving pages of the dialogue *Vergilius orator an poeta* the author, Florus, recounts how he had suffered a set-back at Domitian's Capitoline games[54]. His interlocutor exclaims:

> Tune es ... ex Africa, quem summo consensu poposcimus? Inuito quidem Caesari et resistente, non quod tibi puero inuideret, sed ne Africa coronam magni Iouis attingeret. (Flor. *Verg.* 1.4)
>
> Are you ... the one from Africa, for whom we all concurred in demanding the prize? And that against the wishes of the emperor, who was opposed to it, not because he did not appreciate your youth, but because he did not want Africa to lay hands on the crown of great Jupiter.

This could well have occurred at the Capitoline Games of 94, and if so, the memory must have been still fresh when Statius wrote his poem in the spring of 95[55]. Septimius Severus belonged to a family

---

[52] Note that the later emperor Septimius Severus, possibly the grandson of Statius' addressee, but in any case a relation (cf. p. 219) never lost his African accent: SHA *Sept. Sev.* 19.9.

[53] Cf. Birley 1988: 19 with n. 21.

[54] On Florus and his participation in the Capitoline Games see p. 330.

[55] But the poem could conceivably be from the spring of 94 and would then have been written before the Capitoline Games of that year (which took place in May: see

which in two generations was to produce an emperor, but at this time the ascendancy of Africans at Rome was in its early stages and apparently still met with resistance, even from the Emperor[56]. Therefore Statius does not argue that Africans in general are not inferior, but that Severus in particular is indistinguishable from an Italian.

It may cause surprise that Statius, in 4.5 as elsewhere, does not, sophisticated poet though he is, nimbly skip over the weak spots in his patron's position, but rather belabours the defence to the point of seeming downright embarrassing. This phenomenon is nowhere as striking as in 5.2, the praise of young Crispinus, the son of Vettius Bolanus. When speaking of the *pietas* of the young man, Statius mentions that he has forgiven his mother (76), and then launches into twenty lines of emotionally charged writing, in which he tells how Crispinus' mother has attempted to poison him, how she has been tried, condemned, and executed, and how Crispinus is prepared to pity and forgive her (77–97)[57]. Statius' seeming bluntness must have been caused by a similar lack of delicacy in an existing public discussion. The affair was no doubt widely known, there had been a spectacular trial (at which, one would imagine, the counsel for the defence had tried to suggest dark machinations on Crispinus' part against his mother and perhaps his brother[58]), and the emperor himself had pronounced the death-penalty (91–93). So perhaps Crispinus could do with some publicity, and used his appointment to a military tribunate as a welcome occasion to ask Statius for a poem in which his favour with the emperor would be stressed (cf. 125, 154, 165–80), and in which the acknowledged worth of his father would serve to support a good opinion of the integrity of his character (cf. 30–60). So the existence of powerful gossip, in other words of a strong collective control of private behaviour exercised in circuits of oral

p. 197, n. 12). On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that Florus' defeat occurred in 86 or 90 (cf. Jal 1967: 2.101–04).

56 On the rise of African families at Rome in the second and third centuries see Saller 1982: 145–204 (176–78 and 184–85 on the family of Septimius Severus).

57 A (rather speculative) reconstruction of the mother's motives is offered by White 1973b: 383–84.

58 Cf. 75 *aequaeuo cedere fratri*, which could well be intended to counter accusations of fraternal malice.

communication, provided poetry like Statius' with the function of intervening in these exchanges of opinion on behalf of his patron[59].

Praise of Quiet

A significant number of Statius' patrons did not pursue a political career, but lived a life of wealthy and cultured leisure. To characterise such an existence Statius normally uses the word *quies*, not *otium* (which is ill adapted to the hexameter)[60]. As a term of social life, *quies* was less fixed in its meaning than has sometimes been supposed[61]. It could be applied to senators, and then denote a prudent, even cautious behaviour, but not necessarily the abandonment of a career: Nerva, of whom *quies* was a byword, was consul for the second time in 90, and in 96 donned the imperial purple[62]. More often the word was employed when a senatorial existence was avoided altogether. A knight might prefer to advance in the equestrian rather than in the senatorial career, and could be described to do so "out of a desire for *quies*", *quietis cupidine*[63]. On the other hand, he might wish to live undisturbed on his estates and enjoy *quies* in the sense of *otium*; in this sense *quies* could be *contrasted* with an equestrian career[64].

---

[59] Cf. Veyne 1983 (esp. 9 = 1991: 63–64), summarised 1985: 171–73.

[60] The only form of *otium* to fit into the hexameter is the poetic plural *otia*, which Statius employs only once to characterise the life of a patron (1.3.109; on 4.4.34 see below, p. 316). The passages with *quies* will be cited presently.

[61] Cf. e.g. Syme 1937a: 7–8 = *RP* 1.73–74, Sherwin-White 1966: 118–19, D'Arms 1981: 159–62, Talbert 1984: 76–80.

[62] Cf. Mart. 5.28.4, 8.70.1, and Nerva himself *apud* Plin. *Ep.* 10.58.7.

[63] Tac. *Hist.* 2.86.3, where Grotius changed to *quaestus cupidine*, but Syme 1937a: 7–8 = *RP* 1.73–74 argued that *quietis* should be kept. However, this is the only passage I know where *quies* is used to describe a politically active life; in the case of Annaeus Mela, who lived in *quies* and *otium* according to Sen. *Cons. Helv.* (*Dial.* 12).18.2–3 (similarly Sen. *Contr.* 2.*pr.*3–4), but pursued an equestrian career according to Tac. *Ann.* 16.17.3, a change of mind may have taken place; cf. M.T. Griffin 1976: 84, n. 3, Talbert 1984: 79.

[64] For *quies* and *otium* used in combination and contrasted with an equestrian career cf. Plin. *Ep.* 7.25, *Pan.* 86.2.

The *quies* enjoyed by Statius' patrons is always of the latter blend[65]. Manilius Vopiscus' "fruitful *quies*" (1.3.91) is later in the same poem varied to "learned *otia*" (108–09), Pollius Felix has reached *quies* (2.2.140, 3.*ep*.2) after he has given up his political ambitions (2.2.133–42), Atedius Melior's *quies* is neither indolent nor given to intrigue and cabal (64–69), Septimius Severus chooses *quies* more often than he does acting as a barrister (4.5.49–60), whereas the statuette of Hercules described in 4.6, after having accompanied generals on their campaigns, has finally come to the household of Novius Vindex and there attained "cheerful *quies*" (4.6.96). We may add two others, of whom *quies* is not explicitly predicated, but who did not pursue a career: Claudius Etruscus, who was hampered by his father's disgrace, and Vibius Maximus, who did not proceed beyond the *militiae equestres*[66]. Most of these addressees are depicted as staging a cultural existence against a backdrop of expensive villas (Vopiscus, Pollius), townhouses (Melior), baths (Etruscus), or works of art (Vindex); only in the poems for Severus and Maximus is this not the dominant theme, but that may have to do with the genre of the Horatian ode that Statius chooses in these two cases.

Of these persons, only Manilius Vopiscus is certainly senatorial. We cannot be quite sure that he did not pursue a career before devoting himself to *quies* and *otium*, but the chances are that he did not, although his family had produced a consul (perhaps his father)[67]. In that case he would be a representative of the not uncommon type who preferred to enjoy the benefits of senatorial status without taking upon himself the stress, the cost, and possibly the danger of a senatorial career, either not entering upon such a career at all or abandoning it after the first stages[68]. The others are either certainly not senatorial (Claudius Etruscus, Pollius Felix, Septimius Severus, Vibius Maximus) or quite possibly not senatorial (Atedius Melior,

---

[65] Only in the case of the imperial freedman Abascantus is the word used differently: *nauam ... quietem* in the context of devoted service to the emperor (5.1.76; at 117 *quies* belongs to Abascantus' wife Priscilla).

[66] See pp. 233 and 221, respectively. On Flavius Ursus, who might also be considered, cf. p. 228 (with n. 126).

[67] On the prosopographical problems see p. 226.

[68] Cf. K. Hopkins and G. Burton in Hopkins 1983: 120–200 (esp. 166–69).

Novius Vindex). The relevance of this can perhaps best be illustrated from the case of a well-known figure of an earlier age, who chose to have been a knight, although he could have become a senator.

T. Pomponius Atticus, the friend of Cicero, was honoured in his lifetime with a biography by Cornelius Nepos, whose patron he seems to have been[69]. In this text much attention is paid to Atticus' *humanitas* and *doctrina* (*Att.* 4.1); we learn that the entertainment he provided was always of educational value (14.1), that he was an author himself, writing, among other things, poetry (18), and that he read and practised the precepts of the philosophers (17.3); although Nepos does not mention a particular school, the vocabulary of *quies* (7.3), combined with the image of political life as a turgid sea (6.1, 10.6), suggests Epicureanism, in which Atticus is known to have been interested[70]. This picture is remarkably close, as will be seen, to the one that Statius paints of his "quiet" patrons. Moreover, like Statius, Nepos praises his patron's wealth, and, like Statius, he hardly gives a hint of its sources (cf. 2.3–5, 9.5). For that we have to turn to Atticus' private correspondence with Cicero (not originally meant for publication), whence we learn that he was engaged in a variety of commercial activities, in the first place banking on a grand scale[71]. The suspicion arises that, if there were similar evidence for Statius' patrons, at least some of the *Silvae* could be supplemented in the same way as Nepos' biography. Not only in the Late Republic, but also in the Early Empire there were equestrians who avoided a senatorial career in order to devote themselves to what has been called "acquisitive activities"[72].

The only poem in the *Silvae* where we have an indication (if not more) for such activities is 1.5, on the baths of Claudius Etruscus. Wealth is much in evidence (e.g. 30–31, 43–44), but it has not been used indiscriminately (34–35), so that the effect is one of great re-

[69] Chapters 1–18 were published in Atticus' lifetime (19.1); 19–22 are a later addition. On the relationship between Nepos and Atticus cf. Horsfall 1989: 7–14.

[70] On the imagery in the context of Epicureanism cf. below, p. 318. On the complicated question of Atticus' Epicureanism see Castner 1988: 57–61, Horsfall 1989: 13, 97–98, Perlwitz 1992: 90–97.

[71] See Perlwitz 1992: 30–85. Nepos' omission of this aspect of Atticus' activities is commented upon by Horsfall 1989: 92–93.

[72] See D'Arms 1981, esp. 108–16, 159–62.

finement: "nothing there is vulgar" (47). In much the same way Statius speaks of the villas of Manilius Vopiscus (1.3) and Pollius Felix (2.2), which both comprised baths (1.3.43–46, 2.2.17–20). But the baths of Claudius Etruscus are supplied by Roman aqueducts: the Anio (Vetus or Novus), the Aqua Virgo and the Aqua Marcia (1.5.25–28, Mart. 6.42.18), and therefore were in Rome[73]. But neither Statius nor Martial connects the baths with a house of Etruscus, and both speak as if anybody who wished could choose to visit them (*Silv.* 1.5.60–63, Mart. 6.42). This suggests that they were a separate building, not meant for Etruscus' personal use, but for commercial exploitation[74]. Many such baths existed in Rome, apart from the great imperial establishments, which were free), and those of Etruscus seem to have been among the more luxurious ones, because Martial calls them not *balneolum* or *balnea* (as Statius does: 1.*ep.*30, 1.5.13; 1.5.*tit.* has *balneum*), but *thermulae* (6.42.1)[75]. Commercial baths were often exploited by freedmen, but also by equestrians. Thus, Martial mentions the baths built by Nero's praetorian prefect Tigellinus (3.20.16) alongside those of Gryllus (1.59.3, 2.14.12) and Stephanus (14.60.2, 11.52.4), who on account of their names must be freedman; from elsewhere we know of the baths of an Abascantus, who could (but need not) be the same as Statius' addressee[76]. Etruscus, the equestrian son of an imperial freedman, would not be out of place in this company. If so, Statius does not draw attention to the fact, just as he does no more than hint at the reason why Etruscus would look for occupations outside of politics: the disgrace of his

[73] The precise location is contested. E. Rodríguez Almeida, "Balneum Claudii Etrusci", *LTUR* 1 (1993), 118 argues for identification with the *Balneum Claudianum* on the Quirinal, but usually a location in the Campus Martius is preferred; see Fagan 1999: 361.

[74] On the exploitation of baths in Rome see Nielsen 1990: 1.119–48. Fagan 1999, however, stresses the element of benefaction (124 for Claudius Etruscus), and perhaps private baths should not be seen as a source of income, but as a form of evergetism. However, Statius does not say anything about that either.

[75] As the divergence between Statius and Martial shows, the terminology was not fixed, but in general the word *thermae* denoted luxury and lavishness of decoration; see Fagan 1999: 14–19. For a reconstruction of the architectonic features of the bath, based on Mart. 6.42 as well as Silv. 1.5, see Busch 1999: 39–52.

[76] See Richardson 1992: 48–50; E. Rodríguez Almeida, *LTUR* 1 (1993), 155–66; Fagan 1999: 357–67

father. The wish with which the poem ends, "and may your fate learn to be reborn in a better way" (*et tua iam melius discat fortuna renasci*: 65), is a discreet allusion to the circumstance that Etruscus had accompanied his father into exile, and has now returned with him to Rome[77].

There are other cases where it can be suspected that the *quies* of a patron was not entirely voluntary, but was a necessary measure of self-protection against the dangers of public life. This possibility has been variously discussed for Atedius Melior, the recipient of three poems in Book 2 which are all ostensibly a-political in character: 2.1, on the death of a favourite *puer*, 2.3, on a curiously shaped tree in the garden of Melior's urban dwelling on the Caelius, and 2.4, on the death of a parrot. Especially the epilogue to the poem on the tree has been interpreted to reveal that Melior was nevertheless entangled in politics. After offering the poem as a birthday gift to Melior, Statius continues:

> Tu cuius placido posuere in pectore sedem
> blandus honos hilarisque tamen cum pondere uirtus,
> cui nec pigra quies nec iniqua potentia nec spes
> improba, sed medius per honesta et dulcia limes,
> incorrupte fidem nullosque experte tumultus
> et secrete palam quod digeris ordine uitam,
> idem auri facilis contemptor et optimus idem
> promere diuitias opibusque immittere lucem (2.3.64–71)

> You, whose tranquil breast has provided a dwelling (65) to gentle honour and cheerful, but serious, virtue, whose quiet is not lazy, whose power not unjust, whose ambition not irresponsible, but whose path leads straight through both honesty and pleasure, incorruptible in your loyalty, without any experience of trouble, and in an open way withdrawn, because you organise your life with method, (70) you who at the same time have no difficulty in despising gold and are eminently able to put your riches at the disposal of others and bring your wealth to light[78]

[77] That Etruscus accompanied his father into exile appears from Mart. 6.83, which celebrates the return and must therefore be earlier than 6.42, on the baths. For the expression *discat fortuna renasci* cf. 3.3.154 *patre renato* and 183 *fortuna redeunte*, both referring to the return (cf. also Mart. 6.83.1 *fortuna parentis*).

[78] For text and interpretation (both contested) I generally follow van Dam 1984: 329–33 (rather than Pederzani 1995: 201–07); but at 66–67 I do not think that Me-

The tone seems very apologetic, and it has been suggested that Domitian, who not without reason was fearful of conspiracies, may have harboured a suspicion that Melior was plotting against him[79]. But conspirators at Rome are usually to be found among leading senators, and there is no evidence at all that Melior belonged to this category. He seems indeed to have been a quiet man.

But another interpretation holds that it had not always been so, and that the story Statius tells about the tree is an allegory of Melior's narrow escape from dangerous political involvement[80]. Before this can be discussed, the story needs to be briefly summarised. In some mythical past, a nymph was being pursued by Pan and finally fell down exhausted at the edge of a pond, at the place where Melior's house now stands. Pan was intent on rape, but Diana intervened and woke up the nymph, who precipitously jumped into the water. The god, disconsolate, planted a plane tree on the bank, and instructed it to cover the nymph with its foliage. The tree bent over towards the water, could not penetrate into it, and surged up again skyward—but its mirror image reached the nymph, who gave op her aversion and accepted the excluded branches (8–61). The hypothesis just referred to states that the nymph is to be taken as an allegory for Melior: just as the nymph had saved herself in the nick of time by taking refuge in a quiet, hidden existence, so had Melior. But this fails to make anything of the tree, which is the theme (2.*ep*.14) and starting-point (2.3.1–7) of the poem. And *if* Melior is to be linked with a character in the story, it is with the tree: for Pan's words to the tree, "live long" (43; cf. 49–52), are parallel to Statius' birthday wishes for a long life for Melior (72–77). Of course, there is also a parallel between the tranquillity and translucency of the pond (e.g.

---

lior avoids *pigra quies*, *iniqua potentia*, and *spes improba*, but rather that he has *quies*, *potentia*, and *spes*, but these are (respectively) *pigra*, *iniqua*, and *improba*.

[79] Thus White 1975: 272–73.

[80] See Vessey 1981. A similar allegorical reading has been proposed for 2.4 by Cawsey 1983, who believes that Statius, with Melior's connivance, is offering veiled criticisms of Domitian. For this type of interpretation of Statius' (and Martial's) treatment of the emperor see pp. 387–440.

1–5) and Melior's retired way of life and open character, but this only serves to show that Statius' story is not a systematic allegory[81].

Yet if the epilogue to the poem should indeed indicate that Melior was suspected of subversive political activities, a third hypothesis to explain the situation may be essayed. This would start from the mention, at the end of the poem, of Blaesus, whose glory, through Melior's agency, will flourish once more. Blaesus occurs also in the poem on the death of Glaucias, where it is anticipated that both will meet in the underworld and that Glaucias will recognise Blaesus because he has often seen Melior honour his portrait (2.1.191–207). More light is shed by Martial, who devotes an epigram (8.38) to a fund endowed by Melior, which enabled the *collegium* of the *scribae* to celebrate his birthday[82]. It is probably this to which Statius refers, appropriately enough in a birthday poem. Blaesus seems to have been a member of the aristocracy (*Silv.* 2.1.191, 195), and he is often identified with Velleius Blaesus, the "wealthy consular" of an undated anecdote told by Pliny in a letter from around 96–100 (*Ep.* 2.20.7–8)[83]. However, for chronological reasons this is hardly possible. It appears from Statius (2.1.191–99) that Blaesus had not known Glaucias, who died at age twelve (*Silv.* 2.1.124–25, Mart. 6.28.8–9) in 90 or 91[84]; this implies that Blaesus had died before 80, too early, it seems, to be still topical when Pliny wrote. On the other hand, chronology does not forbid identification with Junius Blaesus,

[81] These remarks may be sufficient to dispose at the same time of the interpretation of Pederzani 1995: 154 (and 154–209 *passim*), who sees in the poem an allegory of patronage, where the tree is the poet Statius and the pond the patron Melior who offers him protection (although in the poem the tree protects the pond [46–47], not the pond the tree).

[82] It is sometimes assumed that Melior's gift was to the *collegium poetarum* (thus i.a. Hardie 1983: 216, n. 65), but although a *collegium scribarum poetarum* is attested in Late Republican or Augustan times (Horsfall 1976: 88–90, White 1993: 289–90, n. 52), and although Martial's mention of a *schola poetarum* (3.20.8, 4.61.3) perhaps implies its continuing existence, the reference may well be to a *collegium* of *scribae librarii (quaestorii)*; cf. the attestations listed by Waltzing 1895–1900: 4.129.

[83] Thus i.a. Sherwin-White 1966: 203 (cf. 202 [and 28–30] on the date of Plin. *Ep.* 2.20) and Syme 1980a: 44–45.

[84] On Glaucias' age at death see van Dam 1984: 130; the date is fixed by Martial 6.28–29.

a partisan of Vitellius in the civil war who was killed in 69[85]. If Melior had fought at this man's side, it would be comprehensible that he pursued no career under the Flavian victors. It would also be comprehensible that Melior's ostentatious devotion to Blaesus' memory may have aroused suspicions, which were then countered by Statius message that his patron had been prompted by no more than incorruptible loyalty (cf. 68). Celebrating the birthdays of former opponents of the Flavians could be dangerous, as Salvius Cocceianus had to experience, who was killed by Domitian for celebrating the birthday of his uncle Otho (Suet. *Dom.* 10.2).

Admittedly, all this is very speculative, and it must be asked whether the epilogue to Statius' poem allows of such speculation at all. Could it not just be a conventional defence of *otium*, such as is also to be found in the other poems of the *Silvae*[86]? Although the acceptance of *otium* in elite mentality grew in the course of the Early Empire, the old Republican notion of the priority of *negotium* ("business") was still strongly entrenched, especially, of course, among senators[87]. The best illustration is to be found in the *Letters* of Pliny the Younger, who stylises himself as the ideal senator. He often expresses his longing for *quies* and *otium*, but never without emphasising that he puts his *negotia* first (e.g. *Ep.* 8.9); accordingly, the highest praise he can give to *otium* is that it is "*almost* [my stress] more beautiful than any *negotium*" (1.9.6)[88]. When Statius writes for someone of Pliny's type, a senator pursuing a career, he adapts to this set of values. Thus in his letter to Vitorius Marcellus (4.4) he urges his addressee to allow himself some vacation (12–45), but only in order to be more energetic afterwards:

> Vires instigat alitque
> tempestiua quies; maior post otia uirtus. (33–34)

---

[85] This identification was proposed by Hardie 1983: 66–67; it is rejected by van Dam 1986: 2747 and 1988: 707 because he infers from *Silv.* 2.1.201 *amissi puerum solacia Blaesi* that Blaesus died only a short while before (or even after) the birth of Glaucias (1984: 169–70). But the phrase does not, to my mind, exclude a longer interval.

[86] This is the position of Billerbeck 1986: 534–35 and Corti 1991a: 196–97; the latter provides a discussion of Statius' treatment of otium in general.

[87] Cf. for a short survey André 1966: 531–41.

[88] For Pliny's views on *otium* see Bütler 1970: 41–57.

> Forces are stimulated and nourished by timely *quies*; *uirtus* is greater after *otia*.

In contrast, Statius' own retirement is permanent: he beguiles his "the *otia* of his life" (49) with poetry, now that he has withdrawn to Naples (49–55), a city which he had characterised in the letter to his wife by the words "the *otia* of an inactive life, and *quies*, never disturbed" (3.5.85–86), and which he had called, writing to Pollius Felix, "the destiny of my *quies*" (3.*ep*.23–24). But for Statius a career would not have been a realistic option, and his identity is that of the full-time poet, whose task consists not in doing deeds, but in singing of them (4.4.69–71)[89]. For his wealthy patrons the legitimation of *otium* could not be quite that simple.

Even those who in principle accepted the choice for *otium*, such as the philosopher Seneca, made high demands of its practice. Writing of the Campanian villa of Servilius Vatia (*Ep.* 55), who was praised by all for his carefree existence, Seneca nevertheless criticised his *otium* as "lazy" (7), and remarked that *otium* is only commendable when it is devoted to philosophy, not to pleasure (4–5); elsewhere he argued that those "most quiet" (*quietissimi*) could—and should—exercise the virtues (*Ot.* [*Dial.* 8].3.4)[90]. This makes it comprehensible that Statius in the epilogue of the poem on Melior's tree stresses that his *quies* was not "lazy" (66), that it was accompanied by serious virtue (65), and that it did not indulge in luxury (70–71).

Almost exactly the same protestations are made in the poem on the villa of Manilius Vopiscus:

> Scilicet hic illi meditantur pondera mores,
> hic premitur fecunda quies uirtusque serena
> fronte grauis sanusque nitor luxuque carentes
> deliciae, quas ipse suis digressus Athenis
> mallet deserto senior Gargettius horto. (1.3.90–93)

---

[89] In the same poem to Vitorius Marcellus he presents his poetry as his "work", from which he sometimes takes a break (4.4.32–33); in 4.6.1–2 his *otia* are connected with *not* writing poetry.

[90] For the dangers of a lazy *otium* cf. also e.g. *Brev. vit.* (*Dial.* 10).18.2 (*nec te ad segnem aut inertem quietem uoco*) and *Ep.* 82.2 (*otii ... et pigritiae*), on the necessity for philosophy *Ot.* (*Dial.* 8).4–6, 10.14, and *Ep.* 82.3 (*otium sine litteris mors est*). On Seneca's attitudes towards *otium* see M.T. Griffin 1976: 315–66.

> Yes, here this moral life is spent in serious contemplation, here fruitful *quies* is observed, and grave virtue with serene brow, and sane elegance, and delights without luxury, for which the old man from Gargettus [i.e. Epicurus] would have left Athens and given up his Garden.

The reference to Epicurus provides the explicit mention of philosophical studies that was lacking in the poem to Melior (perhaps because Melior was not in fact a student of philosophy)[91]. But Statius' apology of Melior's *quies* in 2.3 contains other elements that are not paralleled in the text for Vopiscus, such as the negation of unjust power and irresponsible ambition (66–67) and the assertion of incorruptible loyalty (68), and it is these elements which have given rise to the hypothesis that Melior was under threat from the emperor. Yet they too can be paralleled. Statius says of Novius Vindex, the art collector, that he had a "pure mind, ignorant of guilt" (*casta ignaraque culpae/ mens*) and "old-fashioned loyalty" (*prisca fides*) (4.6.91–92), and it may be that such expressions meant no more than that the addressee is congratulated on his avoidance of politics. If Melior is congratulated more insistently than others, that may be merely because Statius wished to express his compliment as firmly as possible. But a lingering suspicion remains that perhaps there was some external need for such emphasis.

An explicit contrast between *quies* and politics is drawn by Statius in 2.2, the poem on the Surrentine villa of Pollius Felix. The reason is that Pollius had pursued a political career in the past, both in his native Puteoli (Pozzuoli) and in Naples, but had subsequently seen the philosophical truth and achieved *quies* (2.2.133–42). From the perspective of his later insight, his former activities had been an error: he had been "in the heat of youth and magnificent even in mistaking the good" (*iuuenile calens rectique errore superbus*: 137)[92].

---

[91] Although there *secrete* (69) may evoke the Epicurean precept λάθε βίωσας, and *medius per honesta et dulcia limes* (67) may hint at a compromise between Stoicism (*honesta*) and Epicureanism (*dulcia*); cf. van Dam 1984: 331, Laguna 1996: 248, 259.

[92] *Recti* is Courtney's emendation (1971: 95; bettering *pulchri*, proposed by Håkanson 1969: 64–66) for the manuscript reading *plectri*. Van Dam 1984: 272–73 proposed *plebis* (based on *populi*, already suggested by Toup and Otto), but the context seems to require that the error is Pollius' own. Hardie 1983: 67 with n. 76 wishes to keep *plectri* and to take *plectri ... errore* as implying that Pollius had been

The phrase "in the heat of youth" suggests brawls and violence[93], and may contain a veiled reference to the conflicts between the magistrates and the people of Puteoli, documented by Tacitus (*Ann.* 13.48) for the year 58, when Pollius must have been a young man[94]. So perhaps Pollius had been forced to retire from active politics as a result of being involved in these or similar disturbances.

Whether that was the case or not, Statius presents the change in Pollius' life as due to a conversion to philosophy, more precisely to Epicureanism (mentioned explicitly at 113 and alluded to throughout the poem[95]). Statius brings this out by carefully connecting the socio-political notion *quies* with the philosophical term *quies* as the equivalent of ἀταραξία, the ideal of the Epicurean philosopher[96]. In doing this he employs the standard Epicurean image of the tranquil sea as a symbol for the tranquil mind[97]:

> Mira quies pelagi: ponunt hic lassa furorem
> aequora et insani spirant clementius austri;
> hic praeceps minus audet hiems, nulloque tumultu
> stagna modesta iacent dominique imitantia mores. (26–29)

> A marvellous quiet is on the sea: here the waves, tired out, abandon their fury, and the raging South blows more mildly; here the headlong

---

a wandering poet. But Statius speaks of the abandonment of politics, not poetry, which Pollius still practised after his conversion (see below).

93 The parallel passages adduced by van Dam 1984: 272, where youth is connected with *calere* or *calor* all refer to violent outbursts against those with whom one ought to be friendly: Ov. *Ars* 3.571 and Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.27 are about lovers' quarrels, Sen. *Cl.* 1.11.1 and Luc. 2.324 about civil war.

94 This suggestion was made by Hardie 1983: 67. Such conflicts between people and magistrates were endemic in the cities of the Roman Empire: cf. e.g. Plin. *Ep.* 4.22 (Vienna) and 6.31.3 (Ephesos), with the discussion in Veyne 1967: 734–35.

95 On the treatment of Pollius' Epicureanism in the poem see Cancik 1968: 71–75, Nisbet 1978: 1–2. Since the days of Philodemus and Siro Epicureanism was particularly associated with Campania: cf. Stärk 1995: 116, n. 65 (with literature).

96 See van Dam 1984: 210.

97 A closely parallel passage occurs in the poem on the villa of Manilius Vopiscus (where the reference is to a river): *hic aeterna quies, nullis hic iura procellis,/ numquam feruor aquis* (1.3.29–30), with similar anaphora of *hic*. For the motif of the tranquil sea in Epicureanism cf. e.g. Epic. *Ep. Hdt.* 83 (γαληνισμόν is the one-but-last word of the treatise), Cic. *Tusc.* 5.16 (*ut maris ... tranquillitas ..., sic animi quietus ... status*); further references in Nisbet 1978: 1, n. 8.

storm is less daring, and without any trouble the temperate pools lie still, imitating the character of their master.

But another Epicurean metaphor requires Statius to describe the sea in front of Pollius' villa not as tranquil, but as turbid. This metaphor is the representation of the mind as a high citadel from which the sage looks down on the erring multitude[98]:

celsa tu mentis ab arce
despicis errantes humanaque gaudia rides. (131–32)

from the high citadel of your mind you look down on those who err and laugh at human joys

The elevated citadel of the mind is clearly associated with the elevated villa (likewise described with the adjective *celsus*), looking down on the sea (3), where the others are still being tossed to and fro, while Pollius' ship has already safely reached the haven of *quies* (139–41).

Even though the high and domineering position of the villa is formulated in Epicurean terms, it is not in itself an expression of the doctrines of Epicurus, who taught his followers to live inconspicuously (λάθε βίωσας). To compound this contradiction, Statius emphasises the effort that has gone into the building of the villa (and of the temple in 3.1), describing Pollius' achievement as a "taming" and "subjugation" of nature[99]. This is in accordance with contemporary Roman attitudes towards architecture, valuing the victory over natural obstacles (which along the craggy Campanian coast were particularly frequent and intractable), and dominance over the natural environment[100]. But it is not very well in accordance with Epicurus'

[98] Cf. Lucr. 2.1–10.

[99] Cf. e.g. 2.2.31 (*domat*), , 52–59 (*natura ... uicta, ... domuit possessor, ... iugum discentia saxa*, etc.), 75 (*seruit*), 109 (*seruitium*); 3.1.110–22, 96–100, 118–24, 166–70 (*domas*). Although some of these expressions may have been conventional (just as in English a house may "command a view"), their cumulative weight is certainly significant.

[100] On the Roman mentality on architecture at this time (contrasting with earlier, more conservative attitudes) and its expression in the poems of Statius cf. Cancik 1968: 68–69 (basing himself on the work of H. Drerup), Pavlovskis 1973: 1–21, Mielsch 1987: 70. On the intractability of the Campanian coast see D'Arms 1970: 129–30; Stärk 1995: 134: 153 notes that the motif is absent in the otherwise compa-

teaching that Nature has placed all that is necessary within easy reach of mankind[101].

Another aspect of Pollius' lifestyle which diverges from Epicurean precept is his varied poetic activity: he writes hexameters, elegiacs, and iambics (112–15)[102]. In like manner, Manilius Vopiscus, who is also an Epicurean (1.3.93–94), composes lyric, epic, satire, and poetic epistles (1.3.99–104). But Epicurus had condemned poetry, and even though Epicureans such as Philodemus and Lucretius had written poetry, the rejection of poetry by the Epicureans was still taken as a matter of course by Statius' contemporary Plutarch (*Aud. poet.* 15d)[103]. We must conclude that the Epicureanism of Pollius and Vopiscus was not a hard and fast doctrine, but a flexible ideology, part of the cultural identity which legitimised and graced their *quies*.

A final indication for the undogmatic nature of Pollius' Epicureanism is his veneration of Hercules, for whom he built a splendid temple, the subject of *Silvae* 3.1. Hercules was basically a Stoic hero, representing the active life and the victory of human effort over the forces of nature[104]. As such, he was a fitting example for Pollius in his architectural enterprises, and Statius indeed says that in building the temple Pollius has imitated Hercules' labours (3.1.166). Hercules' role as a bringer of civilisation and slayer of monsters, as well as his divinisation, also made him an attractive model for emperors, and Domitian was among those who identified with him[105]. Admittedly,

---

rable, but non-Campanian poem on the villa of Manilius Vopiscus at Tibur (*Silv.* 1.3). See also Myers 2000: 112–15 (who neglects the Campanian dimension).

101 Cf. van Dam 1984: 227, Krüger 1998: 25–27. For this reason wealth itself is also ambiguous for an Epicurean (cf. Cancik 1978: 128, Myers 2000: 122).

102 It is unclear whether 113 *seu uoluit monitus quos dat Gargettius auctor* refers to prose or poetry (cf. van Dam 1984: 261); if the latter, passages like 123–31 may contain echoes from it.

103 Plutarch alludes to a statement by Epicurus himself (163 Us., 89 Arr.). The evidence on the rejection of poetry by Epicurus and the Epicureans is collected and discussed by Dorandi 1982: 15–19 and Gale 1994: 14–18 (cf. 47).

104 See Galinsky 1972: 126–84. The only passage of Epicureanism to discuss Hercules, Lucr. 5. 22–54, is derisive, written probably with polemical reference to the Stoics' adoration, and cannot be used to vindicate Hercules for Epicureanism, as is done by van Dam 1984: 208.

105 In a temple which Domitian had built for Hercules, the god's statue had the emperor's features: Mart. 9.64, 65, 101. Cf. Liebeschuetz 1979: 172–73, Huttner 1997: 309 (and 320–21).

Domitian was no Stoic, but even less was he an Epicurean: he could not possibly be, because Epicureanism recommended withdrawal from public life. What mattered was less philosophical orthodoxy than the ideal of *uirtus* (cf. 3.1.25), more naturally accommodated to the "active" philosophy of Stoicism, but not to be dispensed with by the followers of the "quiet" doctrines of Epicurus. Like Atedius Melior and Manilius Vopiscus, Pollius Felix combined *quies* with *uirtus*: he lived *uirtute quieta*, "in quiet virtue" (2.2.71).

The combination of Hercules and *quies* recurs in 4.6, addressed to Novius Vindex, an art connoisseur who had recently acquired a small statuette by Lysippus, called *Hercules Epitrapezios* (4.*ep.*14, 4.6.*tit.*), in which the great hero was shown as sitting on a rock, relaxing from his labours and drinking wine[106]. Vindex' acquisition was also described by Martial (9.43–44), who probably was present at the same meal at which Statius declares he admired the statuette (1–31)[107]. Statius, like Martial (9.43.2) predictably plays upon the contrast between the tiny *objet d'art* and the muscular might of the one it represents (35–46), but he also enhances the value of the work by other means, most notably by parading its former owners. According to Statius, it had been in the possession first of Alexander the Great, then of Hannibal, and finally of Sulla (59–88). Martial provides exactly the same list (9.43.7–10), so that we may assume that the information derives from explications given by Vindex to his guests. It is very likely that the statuette (or at least its original) was indeed sculpted by Lysippus at the court of Alexander, but the other names are clearly fantastic, and it is difficult to gauge how serious Vindex' claims were taken, even by himself[108]. But Statius uses the list to make an ideological point: Alexander, Hannibal and Sulla were all

---

[106] On this type of statuette, which indeed goes back to Lysippus, see *LIMC* 4 (1988), 774–75 and especially Bartman 1992: 147–86, with discussion of the earlier literature. The word *epitrapezios* is glossed by Statius as *gestamina mensae* (45; cf. 32, 60), i.e. something to be put upon the table (wrongly denied by Cancik-Lindemaier 1971: 58, n. 50); it cannot mean "at table", because ancient banqueters reclined rather than sat; cf. Coleman 1988: 174, Bartman 1992: 151, 154.

[107] See p. 102.

[108] On the list of previous owners see Bartman 1992: 149–52. Setting up a pedigree of famous owners was a common practice (cf. L. Friedländer 1919-23: 3.112–13, Coleman 1988: 175), ridiculed by Martial in a slightly earlier poem (8.6).

kings (or in the case of Sulla, one who had had kingly powers[109]), and moreover warmongers of at least ambivalent reputation. Vindex, however, is of an entirely different stamp:

> non aula quidem, Tyrinthie, nec te
> regius ambit honos, sed casta ignaraque culpae
> mens domini, cui prisca fides coeptaeque perenne
> foedus amicitiae (90–93)

> it is not indeed a court, Hercules, nor regal pomp that surrounds you, but the pure and innocent thoughts of your owner, a man of old-fashioned loyalty, for whom the pact of friendship once begun lasts forever

The sounds a defensive note not unlike the one to be heard in Statius' description of Atedius Melior. The correspondence may even extend further, because Melior's devotion to Blaesus finds a parallel in Vindex' devotion to Vestinus, mentioned by Statius in the immediate sequel as an instance of his everlasting friendship (93–95). In this context, it is perhaps significant that Martial likewise uses the word *aula* ("court"):

> offensus uariae tumidis terroribus aulae
> priuatos gaudet nunc habitare lares (9.43.11–12)

> frustrated by the tumid terrors of various courts, he now rejoices to inhabit a private home

By the time of Statius and Martial, the word *aula* was regularly used for the court of the Roman emperor[110], which strengthens the suggestion that there may have been some trouble between Vindex and Domitian. But nowadays Vindex, although an admirer of Hercules, whose statuettes he acquires and whose praises he is prepared to sing in his poetry (99–105), lives in "happy quiet", *laeta quies* (96).

Statius and Martial probably performed at the very same meal over which the statuette presided, and so strengthened and structured the message that Vindex wished to transmit to his guests. But the

[109] Martial writes of the statuette: *iusserat hic Sullam ponere regna trucem* (9.43.10). The idea of Sulla's *regnum* is frequent in Cicero (e.g. *Har.* 54); under the Early Empire cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.12, Luc. 1.334–35.

[110] See *ThLL* 2.1457.14–1458–42. In the same Book 9 of Martial, *aula* means Domitian's court at 11.8 (*Parrhasia aula*), 16.3, 36.10, and 79.7 (all without a qualifying adjective).

reception of the poetry did not remain confined to the occasion: among the poets present, at least Martial and Statius published their contribution or an edited version of it. So Vindex' message was made available for the world at large and even for posterity. And not only that: the celebration of "quiet" virtue was included in the same collections which also contained more conventional praises of political and military success. In this manner, the *Silvae* and the *Epigrams* helped to constitute the image of an elite which comprised not only those who pursued a career in the emperor's service, whether as senator, knight or freedman, but also those whose claim to the admiration of others was founded in their wealth and culture.

PART THREE

IMPERIAL PATRONAGE

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE EMPEROR AS PATRON

Studies of the contacts between Domitian and Roman literature mostly do not confine themselves to literary patronage, but begin by considering Domitian's own literary production, and go on to discuss his policies with regard to education, libraries, and literary competitions[1]. On the first of these subjects, Domitian's own literary production, it will suffice to be very brief.

Pliny the Elder, in addressing Titus as emperor (*Nat. pr.* 5), mentions the poetic reputation of Domitian, and Tacitus (*Hist.* 4.86.2) and Suetonius (*Dom.* 2.2) confirm that he composed poetry in his youth. Two works are attested, both epics: one on the battle of the Capitol in 69 (Mart. 5.5.7) and one on the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 (V. Fl. 1.12–14)[2]. Domitian abandoned poetry after his accession (Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.91, Suet. *Dom.* 20), but nevertheless all the major writers of his reign, Martial (5.5.7, 8.82.6), Statius (*Ach.* 1.15–16), Silius Italicus (3.619–21), and especially Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.91–92), include his poems among his praiseworthy achievements. So Domitian still cultivated a literary identity, and this predisposed him for literary patronage.

The second subject, that of education, libraries, and literary competitions, cannot be dispatched so speedily, because its connection with the theme of literary patronage demands some thought. An extension of the conceptual model will be needed.

Up till now, this book has been treating literary patronage within the framework of Saller's description of *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. But, as Saller is the first to recognise, personal patronage is only one type of patronage[3]. Among other types, there is

---

[1] Thus the now largely outdated work of Bardon 1940 (280–88, 308–35 on Domitian), as well as the more recent survey by Coleman 1986.

[2] Coleman 1986: 3089–90 and 2000: 28, n. 35 suggests that the poem on the Capitoline war may have been by Sextus, the addressee of Martial's epigram, but the term *caelestia* in *Capitolini caelestia carmina belli* can only refer to the emperor.

[3] Cf. Saller 1982: vii.

also what Finley termed "community patronage", meaning by this expression what Veyne calls "évergétisme" or "mécénat": the phenomenon that a member of the elite of a city offers goods and services ("bread and circuses") to that city[4]. Finley rightly insists that this is no one-way process: the community reciprocates by granting its benefactor honour, prestige, and power. Therefore the phenomenon may be classified as "patronage", the relationship between benefactor and city being asymmetrical *and* reciprocal, as well as having a certain duration.

Just like personal patronage, community patronage could take a specifically literary form. Well-known examples are to be found in the correspondence of Pliny the Younger, who supported his native Comum (Como) by founding a library and contributing to the costs of establishing rhetorical education (*Ep.* 1.8, 4.13). Such things were done by the emperor as well in *his* city, Rome, but they did not directly affect the production of original poetry. The case is different, however, with poetry competitions. These were widely diffused in the Greek world, but did not exist at Rome until Nero introduced them as part of his Greek-style *Neronia*, which were celebrated in 60 and 65, but lapsed afterwards[5]. It was only Domitian who re-established this type of community patronage.

Community Patronage

Domitian instituted two poetry contests, both as part of games which included other events as well[6]. The Capitoline Games were inaugurated in 86 to honour Jupiter Capitolinus and were held every four years in May and June at Rome; the programme comprised literary

---

[4] See Finley 1983: 34–49, Veyne 1976 (and 1985: 114–21). I do not discuss here "municipal patronage" (i.e. the phenomenon that a member of the Roman elite, e.g. a provincial governor, defends the interests of a city), because this does not have a literary dimension.

[5] On poetry competitions in the Greek world see Hardie 1983: 15–30; on the Neronia see Griffin 1984: 160–62 (and elsewhere), Morford 1985: 2018–24 (there is no discussion in Sullivan 1985).

[6] I use the word "games" loosely, because we are dealing not with Roman-style *ludi* (or *munera*), but with Greek-style *agones*: for the distinction see Wissowa 1912: 464–65.

and musical events, horse-racing, and athletics[7]. The Alban Games, first attested for 88 (Mart. 4.1) were celebrated in honour of Domitian's favourite goddess Minerva, and held annually (or nearly annually) in March at Domitian's villa in Alba Longa (Castelgandolfo); here competitions of poets and orators were accompanied by *uenationes* (animal "hunts") and theatrical performances[8]. So in both cases literary patronage was firmly embedded in community patronage, but the community concerned was not the same in either case. The Alban Games were offered—one presumes—to a select audience, specifically invited to Domitian's private residence at Alba; after his death, these games were not continued. The Capitoline Games, on the other hand, were given in the City and to the City; these *were* continued after Domitian's death, with a slightly reduced program, but which still included poetry[9].

The difference between the two games also comes out in the themes set for the poetry contests. At Alba, Domitian himself was lauded, at least if we may generalise from the only evidence we have, a description by Statius of his own victory[10]:

> lux ... Troianae qualis sub collibus Albae,
> cum modo Germanas acies, modo Daca sonantem
> proelia Palladio tua me manus induit auro. (*Silv.* 4.2.65–67)

[7] Suet. *Dom.* 4.4: *certamen triplex ... musicum equestre gymnicum*. Such a programme was Greek (cf. Suet. *Nero* 12: *certamen ... more Graeco triplex, musicum gymnicum equestre*), and Domitian presided wearing Greek dress (Suet. *Dom.* 4.4). On the Capitoline agon see Gsell 1893: 122–25, L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2. 150–51, 231–32 and (by G. Wissowa) 4.76–80, Lana 1951, Tandoi 1968: 134–39, Robert 1970: 6–8 = 1989: 647–49, Loriot 1974: 302–04 (on the date; cf. p. 197, n. 12), Coleman 1986: 3097–100, B.W. Jones 1992: 103–05 and 1996: 42–45, White 1998. I had no access to Caldelli 1993.

[8] Suet. *Dom.* 4.4 (yearly), D. C. 67.1.2 (nearly yearly). On the Alban agon see Gsell 1893: 125–26, L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.232, Coleman 1986: 3097–100. At the site of the villa the remains of a richly decorated theatre have been found: see Darwall-Smith 1994: 150 (with references).

[9] See Suet. *Dom.* 4.4. We have an inscription for the winner in Latin poetry in 106: *ILS* 5178.

[10] Coleman 1986: 3099 is mistaken in referring the testimony of Flor. *Verg.* 1 to the Alban Games: from *corona magni Iouis* (1.4) it is plain that the Capitoline Games are meant.

> such as the day beneath the hills of Trojan Alba, when I sang now of German armies, now of Dacian battles, and your hand crowned me with Minerva's gold.

The theme was Domitian's double triumph over the Germans and Dacians in the autumn of 89; the date is therefore March 90. A four-line fragment transmitted in the scholia to Juvenal and there ascribed to a poem *De bello Germanico* may well derive from Statius' prize-winning composition[11].

In 90, the Capitoline Games were held as well, and it is usually assumed that there the same theme was set. This view depends on a passage from the dialogue *Vergilius orator an poeta* (of which only part of the introduction survives). The author, P. Annius Florus[12] is himself a character in the text, and describes how he had left Rome in disappointment after failing to win the Capitoline prize for Latin poetry "under the emperor Domitian" (1.3) and how he had finally settled in Tarraconensian Spain. But his interlocutor urges him to return to the City:

> nec urbem illam reuisis, ubi uersus tui a lectoribus concinuntur et in foro omni clarissimus ille de Dacia triumphus exultat? (1.6)

> don't you return to Rome, where your verses are declaimed by readers and every forum resounds with that famous triumph over Dacia?

At first sight it looks as if reference is being made to a poem by Florus on a triumph of Domitian; its success under Trajan would then have to be explained from the fact that that emperor as well celebrated Dacian triumphs: the poem would have been "recycled"[13]. But at second sight this looks very improbable, in view of the odium attaching, in Trajanic times, to Domitian in general and to his triumphs in particular[14]. On the other hand, the idea that "that famous

---

[11] *Schol.* Juv. 4.94 (Courtney 1993: 361; *FPL*^{3} 333–34). An alternative hypothesis, defended by Hardie 1983: 61, is that the fragment is connected with Domitian's first German triumph in 83. Statius' piece was sufficiently successful to be parodied by Juvenal (4): cf. Courtney 1980: 195–200, Tandoi 1985, Braund 1996a: 272.

[12] On the identity of the author see Jal 1967: 1.cxi–cxiv, 2.97–110, 123–24, 131–36. My references in what follows are to this edition.

[13] Thus Morelli 1916; the same view is held by L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.231, Lana 1951: 154, Coleman 1986: 3099 (but cf. n. 10).

[14] Cf. Jal 1967: 2.100–03.

triumph over Dacia" does not refer to a poem, but to Trajan's Dacian triumph as an additional reason for wishing to be in Rome, goes against the drift of the text, which continues about Florus' poetical talent before turning to the attractions of Rome[15]. The solution is perhaps that "that famous triumph over Dacia" does mean a poem, but not the one with which Florus long ago had competed at the Domitianic games, but a more recent production, written to honour Trajan, and sent to Rome from Florus' "provincial hiding-place" (1.7) in Tarraconensian Spain[16]. In any case, one should try to look for another theme for Florus' competition piece. Fortunately, there is some circumstantial evidence. Quintilian mentions as a legitimate activity for a Latin orator "the praises of Jupiter Capitolinus, the invariable theme of the sacred contest" (*Inst.* 3.7.4). And we have an inscription (to be discussed below) which records that the theme set to the Greek poets in 94 was an episode from the mythology of Jupiter. What was true of Latin orators and Greek poets was probably true of Latin poets as well, and it is a fair guess that they, too, composed in honour of the god to whom the games were dedicated[17].

The religious theme was not, however, devoid of political significance, as the Capitoline agon was designed to evoke various connections of Jupiter with Domitian. First of all, there were the associations centring on the Capitol. During the battle over the Capitol in 69, Domitian had escaped by hiding in a sacristan's lodge; after the victory of his party he pulled down the lodge to erect in its stead a small shrine to Jupiter Conservator, which after his accession he replaced by a much larger temple, now dedicated to Jupiter Custos, in which he was depicted "in the bosom of the god" (*in sinu dei*: Tac.

---

[15] Against Jal (as in n. 14).

[16] An almost exact parallel would be Mart. 12.8, written shortly (*modo*: 3) after Trajan's entry into Rome, which took place in 99, after Martial had retired to Tarraconensian Spain in 98.

[17] See White 1998: 87–88, who also refers to the model of the Greek games. If this view is correct, the old hypothesis (defended by Kytzler 1960: 350–52) that Statius recited part of his *Thebaid* at the Capitoline Games of 90 (and that *Theb.* 12.818 hints at the defeat) should be rejected. The assumption that Statius could choose his own theme is questionable in any case, because for the Greek poets a theme was apparently set. Moreover, Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.32–33 *saeuum ingratumque .../ ... Iouem* and 5.3.232–33 *lustra parentis/ inuida Tarpei* suggest that Jupiter was the subject of the verse (in spite of Frère 1961: 126, n. 4* and 202, n. 2*).

Hist. 3.74.1). Moreover, the most important temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, that of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, which had burnt down in 80, he rebuilt in a magnificent fashion, for which he is often praised by contemporary poets[18]. These measures supported a more systematic association of the Emperor and the supreme god *as rulers*: just as Jupiter ruled over the whole cosmos, so Domitian ruled over the whole world, in this manner becoming Jupiter's vice-regent on earth[19]. Against this background the praise of Jupiter at the Capitoline Games becomes ideologically relevant.

It is worth while to take a short look at the only surviving specimen of a Capitoline competition piece (from 94): the 43 Greek hexameters improvised by the boy Q. Sulpicius Maximus on the words in which Zeus would chide Helios for having lent his chariot to Phaethon (Τίσιν ἂν λόγοις χρήσαιτο Ζεὺς ἐπιτιμῶν Ἡλίῳ ὅτι τὸ ἅρμα ἔδωκεν Φαέθοντι)[20]. The subject was not political in itself, as can be demonstrated from Lucian, who treats it simply as an exercise in witty *prosopopoeia*[21]. But it is interesting to note a few motifs in Sulpicius' laboured hexameters which do not appear in Lucian's easy prose. One such motif is that Zeus repeatedly calls the cosmos his own (1, 19[22], 23) and shows great concern for the welfare of its inhabitants (e.g. 32, 39), another that Helios is repeatedly said to have

---

[18] Cf. e.g. Sil. 3.622–24, Mart. 13.74, 9.3.7, Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.101–02, 4.3.16, 160–61. Further sources and discussion in Gsell 1893: 92–94, Scott 1936: 92–92, B.W. Jones 1992: 92, Richardson 1992: 223–24 (who is wrong to prefer 89 to the traditional date of 82), S. de Angeli in *LTUR* 3 (1996), 151–52.

[19] The material on Domitian and Jupiter is collected by Sauter 1934: 54–78 and K. Scott 1936: 133–40, and interpreted by Fears 1977: 134–36, 222–26 and 1981: 74–80.

[20] *IGUR* 3.1336; recent translation and discussion in Vérilhac 1982 and Döpp 1996. "Improvised": *uersus extemporales* in the Latin text (B6), καίριον in the heading (A2), σχεδίου in both accompanying epigrams (Ca6, Cb6); cf. Hardie 1983: 83. Apparently at each contest a different theme from the rich mythology of Jupiter was selected. "Boy": both the Latin text and the first line of the first Greek epigram specify that Sulpicius died at the age of eleven.

[21] Luc. *DDeor* 24 (25). There are also similarities with the treatments of Phaethon by Ovid, Philostratus and Nonnus, perhaps all going back to a lost Hellenistic original; see Döpp 1996: 109–12.

[22] I take ἑοῦ to mean "of my own" (cf. LSJ s.v. ἑός 2), not "entrusted to you" (as in Döpp 1996:107); alternatively one might consider emendation of ἑοῦ (EOY) to ἐμοῦ (E(M)OY).

broken the trust that had been put in him (6, 23, 31). Thus, Helios—and *a fortiori* Phaethon—is cast as the irresponsible governor, whereas Zeus is a model of the good ruler. That such an interpretation must have imposed itself on Sulpicius' hearers is suggested by a text of some six years later. In or shortly before 100, Dio Chrysostom held the first of his orations on kingship for Trajan, and in the course of a discussion of the cosmic foundations of good government compared the fate of the bad ruler with Phaethon's (1.46)[23]. The basic allegory is the same, even if Chrysostom locates it one level higher: Phaethon is compared not to a governor, but to an emperor; ironically enough, the emperor meant is Domitian[24]. In Sulpicius, however, Domitian is parallel to Zeus, who is shown as caring for his subjects, restraining his subordinates and wielding the thunderbolt as instrument of his power (20, 42–43)—the same thunderbolt which Domitian often held in pictorial representations[25]. Thus the verse recited at the Capitoline Games gave further articulation to the political myth which these games already invoked by their name and by their procedure[26].

Domitian's games contributed substantially to his public image. When Martial and Statius augur a long life to their emperor, they wish that he may often celebrate the Alban and Capitoline Games (Mart. 4.1.5–6, Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.62). And when Martial enumerates Domitian's services to the gods, he makes Jupiter debtor not only for the Capitoline temples, but also for the Capitoline Games (9.3.7–8), while in mentioning Pallas (10), he certainly means to include a ref-

---

[23] On Dio Chrysostom's first kingship oration see C.P. Jones 1978: 118–19, 136–38 and Moles 1990: 305–37 (333–34 on the date).

[24] One could compare Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.136–35 *hic* [scil. Domitian] *si flammigeros teneret axes,/ Natura melior potentiorque*, if the expression *flammigeros ... axes* meant the chariot of the sun, as contended by Coleman 1988: 132. But it certainly means the heavens (see van Dam 1992: 204, n. 37), and the comparison is with Jupiter (cf. 129), not Helios.

[25] See Fears 1977 and 1981 as in n. 19. The coins are listed at p. 381, n. 10.

[26] According to Suet. *Dom.* 4.4, at the emperor's side were the *Dialis sacerdos* and the *collegium Flauialium*; this juxtaposition underlined the connection between the cult of Jupiter and the cult of the Flavian dynasty: cf. Momigliano 1935 = 1975: 1.657–66 (at 662–64).

erence to the Alban Games[27]. However, although in the Greek world the Capitoline Games ranked immediately after the traditional "sacred" games (Olympian, Pythian, Nemean, Isthmian), the events in Latin poetry—and in Latin oratory—were of rather limited significance[28]. The poets about whom we know were either very young or of low status, or both. To survey just the ones mentioned above: Q. Sulpicius Maximus was a boy of eleven, of freedman descent, to judge from the names of his parents (C7); Florus was a boy when he competed (1.4), born in Africa and ending up as a school teacher in Spain, much to the dismay of his interlocutor (3.2); Statius, finally, was the son of a Greek professional poet and school teacher from Naples, and not of equestrian rank[29]. In Roman mentality, performing in public was not compatible with high status, and Nero had occurred much opprobrium for forcing senators and knights to appear in his games[30]. Partly for this reason, no doubt, his games were not continued after his death. Domitian was more prudent, but this entailed that in Latin poetry (and in Latin oratory[31]) only persons from the margins of the literary scene would compete.

For such persons, however, the games do seem to have provided an avenue to fame and perhaps to the favour of the emperor. Success was a cause for pride (as Sulpicius' parents testify), whereas failure could lead to bitter disillusion. Florus, as we have seen, left Rome after his defeat: the disappointment, he writes, was too much to bear (1.8–9). In Statius' case, his decision to leave Rome in 94 was probably not related to his defeat in the Capitoline Games, which seems to have occurred in 90[32]; yet the disappointment did rankle in

---

27 But the celebration of the *quinquatria Mineruae* was only one of the many honours Domitian paid to this goddess: see Girard 1981, and cf. Fears 1981: 78 for interpretation (Minerva was Jupiter's warrior vice-regent, like the emperor).

28 For the following argument see White 1998. On the importance of the games in the Greek world see Robert 1970: 8 = 1989: 649. The event in Latin oratory was abolished after Domitian (Suet. *Dom.* 4.4).

29 See p. 198.

30 Cf. e.g. D.C. 61.19, Tac. *Ann.* 14.20.4.

31 Palfurius Sura won the prize in Latin oratory, but Suetonius specifies that he had been demoted from the senate (*Dom.* 13.1).

32 See p. 197. It may be noted that in the poem in which he explains why he wants to leave Rome, *Silv.* 3.5, he does mention the defeat (31–33), but not as a reason for his decision.

his mind, as is apparent from the two passages in which he brings it up (*Silv.* 3.5.31–33, 5.3.231–33). It seems as if a poet stood much to gain from a victory in the Capitoline Games. Both Statius and Florus (1.4) speak as if Domitian himself decided on victory or defeat, and although the existence of a body of jurors is attested (*ILS* 5178), the emperor's vote must surely have been conclusive. Does this imply that by winning at the games, a poet could hope to enter into a relationship with the emperor which might be called "personal patronage"? Or did the identity of the emperor as universal ruler preclude such a possibility? This will be the next question to be discussed.

Personal Patronage

In the case of Statius, there is at least one piece of evidence which suggests that he enjoyed the personal patronage of Domitian. In *Silvae* 3.1, written in 91, he mentions, although the context does not demand it, that he has been given a water-supply to his estate at Alba Longa, "by a gift of the great Leader" (*magni... ducis ... munere*). The right to draw water from an aqueduct was a standard imperial benefit[33], and we may assume that Statius received it in recognition of his poetry, perhaps in connection with his victory at the Alban Games in 90[34]. That he went out of his way to incorporate a reference to it in his poem shows that he was proud of it, but hardly amounts to a thanksgiving, because neither the poem nor the book in which it is published are addressed to the emperor.

The *Silvae* do, however, contain a thanksgiving to Domitian: this is 4.2, of which Statius writes in the preface to Book 4 that he had "offered thanks" for having been invited to an imperial meal[35]. Statius states that the meal was offered to senators and knights (32–33), and because he himself in all probability was neither, he may have been invited as a special guest, presumably because of his qualities

[33] See Fron. *Aq.* 3.2, 88.2, 99.3, 103, 105.1, 111.1; in al these contexts the word *beneficium* is used; cf. Millar 1992: 193. Martial likewise requested this privilege: 9.18; cf. below, p. 337.

[34] For the Alban victory see p. 196.

[35] Statius writes *gratias egi*, a reference to the formal term *gratiarum actio* (cf. Coleman 1988: 82–83). The idea of thanks recurs in the title (*Eucharisticon*; cf. p. 270 with n. 51) and in the poem itself (*soluere grates* [7]).

as a poet[36]. In any case he reacts as a poet: "on what lyre shall I proclaim my vows?" (7). At the beginning of the poem he compares himself to Virgil, who celebrated Dido's banquet, and to Homer, who immortalised Alcinous' feast (1–4), and at the end he commemorates the prize Domitian had awarded him at the Alban Games (63–67). The poet is as much present in the poem as is the emperor, and the connection between the two is emphasised in the telling collocation of the pronouns "you" and "I" in line 14. This should not be explained by alleging that Statius was "the fêted guest"[37], but by recognising that his public role as a panegyrist was embedded in a private relationship: he had received a personal benefit, and he expressed his personal thanks. Nevertheless Statius makes it clear that this was the first invitation to the emperor's table that he had ever received (5–6, 12–13), and the first favour comparable to his success at Alba around five years ago (62–67). And at the meal itself, Statius never entered into any kind of communication with Domitian: his highest bliss was to watch (16, 40)[38]. So even though he could attribute some status to himself as a poet, he had little as a social being.

The epigrams of Martial offer a similar picture, although there is a markedly more informal attitude towards the emperor, whether as a consequence of Martial's higher social status or of the more relaxed genre in which he wrote or of both. Martial, too, received material benefits from the emperor, of which the most important was the *ius trium liberorum* ("right of three children"), i.e. the privileges granted to those with three children or—and that is at stake here—to those without, by special favour of the emperor[39]. Martial had received this benefit from "both emperors" (3.95.5, 7.97.5), one of whom must be Domitian, because Martial's request for the *ius*, as well as his thanks for receiving it, appear in Book 2 (2.91–92), published in 86 or 87. The other of emperors would then be Titus, and Domitian would have renewed a favour bestowed by his predecessor. Yet there is a

---

36 For Statius' rank cf. p. 198.

37 Thus Newmyer 1979: 115, rightly contradicted by Vessey 1983: 214.

38 A similar distance may be observed in the poems which flank 4.2 in Book 4: as Statius states in the preface, in 4.1 he has "adored" (*adoraui* [6]) Domitian's seventeenth consulship, in 4.3 he has "admired" (*miratus sum* [7]) the new road in Campania.

39 On the *ius trium liberorum* see Kaser 1971: 320.

problem with Martial's claims, because Dio Cassius expressly states that Domitian on his accession confirmed all the gifts made by his father and brother (67.2.1)[40]. So it is puzzling to read a particularised petition to Domitian in a book published some five years after his accession (although the poem itself may of course be older). There seem to be two possibilities: either Domitian did, after all, allow himself to be petitioned, or 2.91–92 are a fiction, presenting as a personal favour what in reality had been the automatic consequence of a general decision. In any case Martial specifies his poetic contributions as the reason for the benefit (2.92.2; cf. 2.91.3–4, 7–8).

In poem 3.95 Martial mentions other imperial favours apart from the *ius trium liberorum*: an honorary tribunate (9)[41] and citizenship granted to clients of his "by the emperor's gift" (11). In poem 4.27 he boasts that Domitian in appreciation of his books has given him "gifts that no other could have given" (4), presumably referring to the same rewards as in 3.95[42]. Elsewhere Martial petitions for a further imperial benefit, the right to draw water from an aqueduct to his town-house, which he had perhaps newly acquired (9.18)[43]. We saw above that this was bestowed on Statius, but we do not know whether Martial was equally successful, because there is no further reference in his *Epigrams*[44].

Scepsis on this count is justified, because in a number of poems Martial shows himself very diffident about the emperor's inclination to grant his requests. In Book 5, which is dedicated to Domitian (5.1) and adapted to his tastes by leaving out obscenity (5.2), Martial raises the issue of his material circumstances in a small group of epigrams, two of which are addressed to the emperor[45]. In 5.15 Do-

---

[40] Cf. Mommsen 1887–88: 2.2.1126–29, and with respect to Martial Daube 1976.

[41] Such appointments were in the gift of the emperor; see p. 5 (also for the suggestion that Martial in fact owed his tribunate to the imperial favourite Paris).

[42] Note the echo of *praemia laudato tribuit mihi Caesar* (3.95.3) in *laudare soles ... honorato non sola uoce dedisti ... dona mihi* (4.27.1–4).

[43] On the town house see p. 50 with n. 33. Poem 9.18 has been quoted at p. 52.

[44] The fact that Martial published the request does not imply that he was successful (Millar 1992: 496) nor does the absence of a poem of thanks imply that he was not (L. Friedländer 1919–23: 2.242, Szelest 1974: 106, Howell 1995: 4); thus Saller 1982: 35, n. 120.

[45] The other epigrams are 10 (to Regulus), 13 (to a fictional "Callistratus") and 16 (to *lector amice* [2]). All discuss Martial's success with the reading public, and in so

mitian is made to ask what profit Martial's poems bring him; the answer is that they bring him no profit, but that he enjoys writing them (5–6). In 5.19 the dialogue is continued: Martial complains about the lack of generous patrons, and suggests that Domitian should become his patron (15). But Domitian is represented as quietly laughing at Martial's self-interested proposal (17–18).

In Book 6 Martial goes one step further and actually reports failure in securing a gift from Domitian (6.10). In commenting on this he compares the emperor with Jupiter:

> Pauca Iouem nuper cum milia forte rogarem,
>   "Ille dabit" dixit "qui mihi templa dedit."
> Templa quidem dedit ille Ioui, sed milia nobis
>   nulla dedit: pudet, ah, pauca rogasse Iouem. (1–4)

> When recently I happened to ask Jupiter for a few thousands, he said: "He will give them who gave me temples" [i.e. Domitian]. Temples indeed he gave to Jupiter, but thousands to me he gave none: I am ashamed, ah, to have asked Jupiter for only a few.

The connection of the ideas "asking" and "giving" with both the emperor and the supreme god recurs in Books 6 through 9 in other poems concerned with exchange with the emperor[46]. In 7.60 Martial addresses Jupiter:

> cum uotis sibi quisque te fatiget
> et poscat dare quae dei potestis,
> nil pro me mihi, Iuppiter, petenti
> ne suscensueris uelut superbo.
> Te pro Caesare debeo rogare:
> pro me debeo Caesarem rogare. (3–8)

> while everyone wearies you with wishes for himself and demands what gods like you can give, (5) I request nothing on behalf of myself, Jupiter, so do not criticise me for pride. It is you I must ask on behalf of Caesar: on behalf of myself it is Caesar I must ask.

In 8.24 he directly addresses Domitian, but with marked diffidence:

---

doing indirectly recommend him to the emperor; cf. Merli 1993: 241 with n. 41 and 1998: 148–53.

[46] Apart from the poems to be quoted below (6.87, 7.60, 8.24 and 82), the request for water (9.18), mentioned above, also belongs to this group. Books 10 through 12, written under Nerva and Trajan, do not contain any poems about exchange with the emperor.

Si quid forte petam timido gracilique libello,
inproba non fuerit si mea charta, dato.
Et si non dederis, Caesar, permitte rogari:
offendunt numquam tura precesque Iouem. (8.24.1–4)

Should I happen to ask for something in my timid, slender little book, if my roll be not impertinent, give it. And if you do not give it, Caesar, allow yourself to be asked: incense and prayers never offend Jupiter.

Giving is of the essence of a god, but likewise being asked: a god does not shower his bounties spontaneously and indiscriminately, but in response to individual prayers. The same is true of the emperor, whose goodness can therefore be measured by his accessibility to petitioners: "allow yourself to be asked"[47]. But this does not mean that he will infallibly respond by giving: like the gods, he takes into account the deserts of the petitioners:

Di tibi dent et tu, Caesar, quaecumque mereris:
di mihi dent et tu quae uolo si merui. (6.87)

May the gods and you, Caesar, give you all you deserve: may the gods and you give me what I wish, if I have deserved it[48].

The merits Martial can lay claim to are those of his poetry, as he had already proclaimed in his epigrams on the "right of three children". In order to deserve gifts, Martial can make the gift of poetry. The final poem of Book 8, which is a dedication of the book to the emperor, contains a witty variation on this theme:

Dante tibi turba querulos, Auguste, libellos
nos quoque quod domino carmina parua damus,
posse deum rebus pariter Musisque uacare
scimus et haec etiam serta placere tibi. (8.82.1–4)

While the crowd gives you plaintive little books, Augustus, the reason that I too give small songs to my lord is that I know that my god can have leisure for the Muses as well as for government, and that these garlands too are pleasing to you.

The poet is making a gift, but he is also making a request: the "small songs" (2) are analogous to the "little books", the *libelli* (1), by

[47] Cf. Millar 1992: 468–69.

[48] Martial later applies the formula "may the gods give you what you deserve" to Trajan (but significantly without the adulatory addition "and you"): 10.34.1; similarly Plin. *Pan.* 28.6.

means of which people conveyed their entreaties to the emperor[49]. The analogy extends to the term itself, for *libellus* is also the word for a book of poetry such as Martial is now offering[50]. A *libellus* in this last sense demands to be read because it is poetry, but once it is being read it may turn out to be a *libellus* in the first sense as well, i.e. to contain a request[51]. Martial had already played on both meanings of the word in 8.24 (quoted above), when he suggested that he might be asking for something in his "little book". And in an earlier poem, which likewise contains a request and likewise identifies the emperor with Jupiter, he had written[52]:

> Non est quod metuas preces iniquas:
> numquam grandia nec molesta poscit
> quae cedro decorata purpuraque
> nigris pagina creuit umbilicis. (5.6.12–15)

> There is no reason to fear unwarranted requests: no large or bothersome demands are ever made by a page which is decorated with cedar oil and purple, and has grown longer with black knobs.

Martial describes the exterior of a carefully produced book of literature, more precisely of a dedication copy: impregnated with cedar oil, protected by a purple wrapper, and wound around a cylinder with protruding knobs[53]. In such a roll, he states, no "unwarranted requests", "large or bothersome demands" will be read. The implication surely is that warranted requests, small and pleasing demands might be expected and acceptable in a literary *libellus*.

Ordinary *libelli* were handed to the emperor whenever petitioners could find access to him, mostly at the *salutatio*[54]. Were books of

---

[49] See Millar 1992: 240–52, 537–49.

[50] But in 11.1.5, speaking of the powerful imperial freedman Parthenius, Martial calls his poetry books *libri* to distinguish them from the petitions with which Parthenius has to deal: *Libros non legit ille sed libellos*. Cf. also 5.6 (quoted below), addressed to the same Parthenius.

[51] Cf. Millar 1992: 497 on literary works as a "privileged means of access, which could be used ... to secure benefits".

[52] Line 7 of this poem (*timidam breuemque chartam*) is echoed in the first line of 8.24 (*timido gracilique libello*), as well as in 12.11.7 (*timidumque breuemque libellum*).

[53] Cf. p. 130 with n. 129, and p. 366 with n. 34.

[54] See Millar 1992: 240–42.

poetry offered in the same manner, or could they reach the emperor by more privileged routes? Statius, although he did not dedicate any of his published books to the emperor, did offer his individual imperial poems to him, just as he offered his non-imperial poems to their respective addressees before publication; precisely because of this, he called his individual poems *libelli*[55]. The words he uses are *tradere* ("to hand over") and *dare* ("to give")[56]; this vocabulary seems to imply that he found personal access to the emperor, perhaps through the good offices of intermediaries. Martial offered not only individual poems to the emperor, but also some of his published books: Book 1 and Books 4–9 begin with initial sequences dedicating the book to Domitian, sometimes supported by similar closing sequences. Martial regularly assumes (or hopes) that the emperor personally reads his poems, but only in one case does he speak as an eye-witness:

> At quam non tetricus, quam nulla nubilus ira,
> quam placido nostras legerat ore preces! (6.10.5–6)

> But how far from stern, how far from clouded by any anger, with how calm a countenance did he read my prayers!

In the other cases either nothing is said about the poet's presence, or the implication is that he was absent, because he has entrusted the presentation (or commendation) of his book to an intermediary[57]. Within the context of the patronage model, these intermediaries demand separate treatment.

Brokerage

It is a serious problem whether or not the emperor personally received, read, and answered all the *libelli* (in the sense of petitions)

---

[55] See p. 280; among the imperial poems, only 1.1 is explicitly called a *libellus* (1.ep.16).

[56] See 1.*ep*.16–19, 2.*ep*.16–18 (both *tradere*), and 4.*ep*.28–29 (*dare*); see further pp. 361–365.

[57] No specifications: 1.101.1–2, 2.91.3–4, 6.64.14–15, 7.12.1–2. Intermediary: 4.8 (Euphemus), 5.6 (Parthenius), 7.99 (Crispinus); cf. 5.1, where the book is sent to the emperor, whose present domicile Martial professes to ignore, so that an intermediary is to be inferred.

submitted to him: the sources represent him as doing so, but this may be an authenticating fiction, and in actual fact the work may have been done by the freedman officials in the department *a libellis*[58]. A similar problem arises with *libelli* in the sense of literary works: were all the works offered to the emperor really all read, judged, and rewarded by him in person, or was the task delegated to freedman officials, in this case those in the department *a studiis*?[59] The problem is bound up with the question of the duties of this department and more specifically the freedman in charge, "the" *a studiis* (designated, as was common, by the mere name of the department he headed[60]). Earlier proposals, that he did research for imperial decisions or acted as ghost-writer of imperial speeches, are unconvincing, and the most plausible view is that his concerns were, quite simply, with the imperial *studia*, i.e. with the cultural activities of the emperor: like other Roman aristocrats, emperors prided themselves (in varying degrees, dependent on their personal identities) on their *studia*, and like other Roman aristocrats, they employed the most highly educated of their freedmen as advisers[61]. We may now ask in how far the literary patronage of the emperor was in the hands of his *a studiis*.

From the period before Trajan, there is only one certain *a studiis* of whom anything is known at all: Polybius, the addressee of the *Consolatio ad Polybium*, written by Seneca when he was in exile on Corsica[62]. Although the avowed purpose of this work was to console Polybius with the death of his brother, its real aim was to move him

---

[58] Cf. Miller 1992, ch. 5 ("The emperor at work"), with the criticisms of Hopkins 1978b (review of the first edition).

[59] Thus Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 83–86.

[60] On the history of this terminology see Weaver 1972: 259–66. It should be noted that from the reign of Domitian onward, freedmen were being replaced by knights as heads of the Palatine departments: see Boulvert 1970: 252–53, Millar 1992: 83–91, Weaver 1994: 355–58, Eck 1998: 88–93 (≈ 252–56) (and cf. below on Sextus).

[61] Thus Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 83, contradicting the hypotheses of Hirschfeld 1905: 332–33 (research, accepted by Boulvert 1970: 379) and Millar 1992: 205 (ghost-writing).

[62] That Polybius was *a studiis* is apparent from the explicit testimony of Suetonius (*Cl.* 28) and from the emphasis on *studia* in Seneca's *Consolatio ad Polybium* (*Dial.* 11), e.g. 5.2, 6.2–3, 7.3, 8.2, 18.1).

to intercede with Claudius on Seneca's behalf. It is tempting to conclude that Polybius as *a studiis* specifically dealt with the requests from literary men (such as Seneca), but this temptation is to be resisted, because Seneca himself says that Polybius received petitions (*libelli*) from "many thousands" of persons (*Dial.* 11.6.5): even allowing for flattering exaggeration, these cannot all have been literary men. Apparently Polybius was selected as the recipient of petitions not because of his formal functions, but because of his informal position within the palace[63]. For Seneca, Polybius' cultural interests were doubtlessly another motive for selecting him, but there is no warrant for the conclusion that Seneca addressed Polybius as the director of imperial literary patronage.

Another Claudian figure has been thought to offer better evidence. This is C. Iulius Callistus, the dedicatee of Scribonius Largus' pharmaceutical *Compositiones*. In the dedicatory letter he is thanked for having transmitted Largus' medicinal writings to the emperor, and thus having brought profit and pleasure to the author (*ep.* 13). Yet the only function we know Callistus to have fulfilled is the one of *a libellis* (D. C. 60.30.6b), and the idea that he was *a studiis* lacks an independent foundation: it is a guess based precisely on this passage of Scribonius Largus[64].

Until the time of Hadrian we know of no other possible *a studiis*, apart from a certain Sextus, who is addressed by Martial in a poem from the year 89 (5.5). The *praenomen* cannot belong to an imperial freedman, and this suggests that already by 89 Domitian had started to replace freedmen by equestrians as heads of the Palatine departments[65]. The question is to what department Sextus should be as-

---

[63] Generally it has been inferred that Polybius concomitantly held the post of *a libellis* (e.g. Hirschfeld 1905: 326–27, Boulvert 1970: 95, Weaver 1972: 261), but the inference seems unwarranted: *any* influential courtier would find himself besieged by petitioners. A good example is Parthenius, *a cubiculo* (chamberlain) of Domitian and subsequently of Nerva (see below), of whom Martial writes: *Non libros legit ille sed libellos* (11.1.5)—although here, too, it has been inferred that he had actually become *a libellis* as well (Kay 1985: 54). See Millar 1967: 16–17 and 1992: 250.

[64] See Bücheler 1882: 327–28 = 1927: 449–50. On Callistus: *PIR*^{2} J 229.

[65] That Sextus is a knight is also suggested by another poem from the same book (5.38), where *Sexte* is an isolated vocative in a poem on the usurpation of equestrian

signed. Martial asks him to put his books alongside those of Domitius Marsus and Catullus, and this suggests that Sextus was *a bibliothecis*, responsible for the admission of books to the Palatine libraries, and for the classification of those books. Now we know of three persons, equestrians like Sextus, whose career comprised the post of *a studiis* as well as that of *a bibliothecis*: Suetonius (probably under Trajan), Julius Vestinus (under Hadrian), and Volusius Maecianus (under Antoninus Pius); at least of the third it is certain that he held both posts concomitantly rather than successively[66]. So it might be conjectured that Sextus, too, combined both posts[67]. But even if this were the case, other evidence from Martial's poetry forbids the conclusion that the *a studiis* single-handedly controlled the imperial literary patronage: for it appears that Sextus is only one out of Martial's many brokers at court.

One of those other brokers was Crispinus, an equestrian who has been conjectured to have held one of the high equestrian posts, such as that of *praefectus annonae* (responsible for the corn supply) or that of *praefectus praetorio* (in charge of the Praetorian Guard)[68]. But such a post is not attested, and in any case was not relevant for Martial: what counted for him was that Crispinus belonged to the group of the "friends of the emperor", the *amici principis*[69], and thus was in regularly contact with Domitian: when Martial's work is read at court, Crispinus is likely to be present, and so he can put in a good word for the poet (7.99).

---

rank. He is not, however, included in Pflaum 1960–61 or 1982. On the replacement of freedmen by knights see n. 60 above.

[66] See Pflaum 1960–61: 219–24, 245–47, 333–36. Van't Dack 1963 argued that Suetonius and Vestinus likewise combined tenure of both posts. Because Suetonius and Vestinus were scholars and Maecianus a jurist, it is improbable that Sextus should be identified with the orator and rhetor Sex. Julius Gabinianus, as proposed by Vassileiou 1983.

[67] This is indeed generally assumed, e.g. by Hirschfeld 1905: 333 and L. Friedländer 1919–23: 1.56. Thiele 1916: 253–54, n. 1, however, denied that Sextus held either post.

[68] The conjectures are founded on *princeps equitum* at Juv. 4.32, on which see Courtney 1980: 207; cf. also Vassileiou 1984, B.W. Jones 1992: 69–70.

[69] On the *amici principis* see Crook 1955: 21–30, Millar 1977: 110–22, Saller 1982: 41–78.

Apart from the *amici principis*, the most promising brokers were the slaves and especially the freedmen of the imperial household, the *familia Caesaris*[70]. Among these, the most revealing presence in Martial's poetry is perhaps that of Euphemus, Domitian's *tricliniarcha* ("master of the dining-room", steward), whom Martial asks to introduce his poems into an imperial banquet (4.8)[71]. The train of thought is the same as same as in a poem for Pliny the Younger (10.20 [19])[72]: the *libellus* should not approach the great man in the daytime, but at night, when wine has made him more receptive to the kind of licensed entertainment that Martial's epigrams provide. But in the case of the emperor the *libellus* stands in need of a broker to gain access to the patron's table—and who could be more suitable for the job than the supervisor of that table?

Euphemus' influence was limited to one type of occasion only; almost unlimited, on the other hand, was the influence wielded by Domitian's closest personal servant, Parthenius, the *a cubiculo* ("high chamberlain")[73]. Just how closely Parthenius lived with his master can be gauged from the role he played in the latter's assassination in 96: it was he who removed the blade from the dagger Domitian kept under his pillow, and it was he who engineered a private audience for the murderer[74]—the *a cubiculo* controlling admission to the imperial presence. This control of admission could extend to books as well as people; hence Martial could ask him:

admittas timidam breuemque chartam
intra limina sanctioris aulae (5.6.7–8)

---

[70] On the *familia Caesaris* see Weaver 1972, Boulvert 1970 and 1974, Burton 1977. A possible broker of Martial's who may or may not have belonged to the *familia Caesaris* was the pantomime dancer Paris (cf. Leppin 1992a:272–75), to whom Martial perhaps owed his tribunate: see p. 5.

[71] On Euphemus as *tricliniarcha* see Boulvert 1970: 180, n. 622.

[72] Pliny quoted a part of the poem in his "obituary" of Martial (*Ep.* 3.21); see pp. 37–39 for a translation.

[73] On the function of *a cubiculo* (head of the *cubicularii*) see Boulvert 1970: 241–47 (243–44 on Parthenius).

[74] D.C. 67.17.1; cf. Suet. *Dom.* 16.2. Parthenius also actively participated in the designation of Nerva as Domitian's successor: Eutr. 8.1, Oros. 7.11.1 (less explicitly D.C. 67.15.4–5).

> admit my timid, brief roll within the threshold of the more sacred part of the court

After the coup against Domitian, Parthenius was retained by Nerva, so that Martial could go on using his old contact[75]. He even went on using the old phrases, as appears from the following lines (where the formal addressee is the Muse):

> Et si forte—sed hoc uix est sperare—uacabit,
> tradat ut ipse duci carmina nostra roga,
> quattuor et tantum timidumque breuemque libellum
> commendet uerbis: "Hunc tua Roma legit". (12.11.5–8)

> And if it happens—but this can hardly be hoped for—that he has time, ask him to hand my poems personally to the Leader, and commend my timid, brief little book with only four words: "This your Rome reads".

In the two poems just quoted Parthenius appears as a true broker: he is courted for the "secondary order resource" consisting of his influence with another patron, in this case the emperor. But members of the *familia Caesaris* of course disposed of "first-order resources" as well: thus, we find Martial thanking Parthenius for the gift of a toga—and requesting a cloak in addition (8.28; cf. 9.49). This example shows that Martial entertained with Parthenius a relationship along the lines of his relationships with other patrons, brokerage being only a special kind of patronal favour. Parthenius is an *amicus* (8.28.1), whose *amicitia* with the poet Martial is motivated from a literary identity: he was a poet himself, as Martial indefatigably recalls[76]. Successful freedmen tried to emulate the aristocratic life-style not only materially, but also culturally: within Martial's *Epigrams* there is little difference between Parthenius, the ex-slave, and any Roman knight or senator[77].

But however fully the great imperial freedmen may have been assimilated to the Roman elite, their social position, like that of all freedmen, remained deeply ambiguous. It is clear from the instances just adduced that there was not a horizontal dividing-line in Roman

---

[75] See p. 438.

[76] See 5.6.1–2, 8.28.1, 9.49.3, 11.1.6, and 12.11.1–4.

[77] Similarly, Martial's poem on the villa of Entellus (8.68), who was Domitian's *a libellis* (D.C. 67.15.1), is in no way different from his poems on the villas of Faustinus (3.58, 10.51), Julius Martialis (4.64), or Domitius Apollinaris (10.31).

society with the freeborn above it, and those of servile descent below it; rather there was a vertical dividing-line: at any given level of wealth and influence freedmen were separated from their freeborn peers by juridical handicaps and social stigma[78]. In the case of imperial freedmen the ambiguity was exacerbated by their interference with the government of the empire: it was unacceptable to traditional mentality to see substantial power wielded by those who were not Roman citizens by birth. The difficulty was compounded by the ambiguity inherent in the position of the emperor himself: not being a formal monarch, he had to humour senatorial susceptibilities by behaving as merely the first among senators[79]. So his household had to be presented as merely the first among senatorial households, not as a bureaucracy usurping the prerogatives of the traditional, "republican" administrative bodies.

Hence the amount of power granted to imperial freedmen played an important role in the typology of "good" and "bad" emperors. The worst in this respect was Claudius, under whom such figures as Polybius, Pallas, Narcissus and Callistus attained to scandalous prominence[80]. Hence, when after Claudius' death, his follies and vices were castigated in a satire written for the benefit of his successor Nero (Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*), his lack of control over his freedmen was one of the main points of attack[81]. Although the excesses under Claudius were not repeated, constitutionalist indignation never completely subsided until Trajan and after him Hadrian ostentatiously curbed the powers of their freedmen[82]. Of course Domitian was retrospectively criticised, e.g. when Pliny in his *Panegyric* said to Trajan:

> Most emperors, even though they were the masters of their subjects, were the slaves of their freedmen. By their opinions and by their advice they were ruled, through them they listened and through them they spoke, through them even praetorships, priesthoods and consulates

[78] Cf. Veyne 1961 = 1991: 13–56. On the ambiguous status of freemen see also p. 21.

[79] Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1982.

[80] See e.g. Suet. *Cl.* 28, and cf. the discussions in Millar 1992: 75–76 and Boulvert 1970: 341–57, 438–42.

[81] Cf. Nauta 1987: 75–76, 87, 90.

[82] Cf. Boulvert 1970: 442–43 and 1974: 232, Fabre 1994: 337.

> were requested, nay from them. (2) You, however, while honouring your freedmen to the highest degree, keep treating them as freedmen, and you believe that it abundantly suffices for them to be considered righteous and useful. For you know that a chief characteristic of a weak emperor is powerful freedmen. (88.1–2)

Even in Domitian's lifetime, Martial feels it necessary to state that Domitian's freedmen have nothing of the arrogance of their predecessors under earlier emperors (9.79)[83]. But his *Epigrams* as a whole present a "monarchic" rather than a "civic" picture of the imperial household, and the same is true of Statius' *Silvae*, which include celebrations of the graceful locks of an imperial cupbearer (3.4) and of the ponderous duties of the freedmen responsible for the finances of the empire (3.3) and the imperial correspondence (5.1). For both Statius and Martial the need for imperial patronage entailed an "imperial" perspective, and the need for brokerage involved them in the complex network of power and influence at court[84]. Thus it could happen that they received orders to write poetry from a cupbearer:

> Earinus praeterea, Germanici nostri libertus, scis[85] quam diu desiderium eius moratus sim, cum petisset ut capillos suos, quos cum gemmata pyxide et speculo ad Pergamenum Asclepium mittebat, uersibus dedicarem. (*Silv.* 3.*ep.*16–20)

> And then Earinus, freedman of our beloved Germanicus—you [*scil.* Pollius Felix, the addressee of the preface] know how long I have waited in complying with his wish, when he asked me to write a verse dedication for his hairs, which, together with a jewelled casket and a mirror, he was sending to Aesculapius at Pergamum.

---

[83] Boulvert 1974: 232, n. 235 mistakenly has this poem refer to "la perfection des serviteurs de Trajan".

[84] In this section the brokers of Martial have been discussed; for Abascantus, Domitian's *ab epistulis*, as a broker for Statius see pp. 193–194.

[85] Vollmer 1898: 384 emended the manuscript reading *scit* to *scis*, because an appeal to the dedicatee of the book is more logical than an appeal to Earinus, and because *eius* (for *suum*) is anomalous. His view was combated by Housman 1906: 44 = 1972: 2.649-50 and Håkanson 1969: 82–83 (and is not even mentioned in Courtney's apparatus), but defended by Laguna 1992: 114–15 and Pederzani 1995: 219.

Statius responded with *Silvae* 3.4 and Martial—if he too had been approached by Earinus[86]—with a cycle of epigrams (9.11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 36). Earinus was concerned to have an event from his private life commemorated, not to solicit praise for the emperor or the emperor's policies. But did that happen? Was some, or most, or all, of the imperial poetry of Statius and Martial written to order? This question forms the subject of the following section.

Initiative

Neither in Martial nor in Statius is there any reference to their receiving commands or instructions from the court[87]. Yet this does not necessarily imply that such commands or instructions had never been issued. As in the case of non-imperial poems, both poet and patron might have an interest in making the poetry appear as a spontaneous tribute, even if it were nothing of the kind[88]. Yet there are a number of imperial poems where a commission is *a priori* unlikely. This holds e.g. for Martial's requests for support from the emperor that have been discussed above: here we see a poet manoeuvring for his own advantage, not executing orders for panegyric. And if Martial does write panegyric, it is often marked more by the frivolousness of the rest of his production than by the seriousness associated with an official version. Good examples are his cycles on the theatre edict in Book 5 and on the *lex Iulia* in Book 6, which because of this frivolous character have sometimes been construed as subversive by modern scholars[89]. Certainly the poems in Books 8 and 9, mainly centring on the emperor as benefactor of Rome (by giving games and building temples), are more serious, and it cannot be excluded that Martial there acted in accordance with wishes of the court. But the differences even between Books 8 and 9 should give one pause. Book 8, which contains significantly more imperial poems than the previous

[86] It cannot be excluded that Martial wrote of his own account, whether in order to vie with Statius or not; cf. Henriksén 1998–99: 1.92. Henriksén also notes (1.89, 182) that poem 36 may have been added afterwards, when the cycle was published.

[87] On the text of Stat. *Silv.* 1.*ep.*17–19 see below, p. 350.

[88] Cf. p. 88 (on Martial) and p. 245 (on Statius).

[89] This will be discussed in detail at pp.

books, opens with a dedicatory epistle to the emperor, in which Martial explains that, in keeping with the panegyrical character of the book, he has eschewed obscenity; Book 9, although it contains even more imperial poems than Book 8, opens with a private letter, and readmits obscenity. Similarly Book 5, sent to emperor in 5.1, is free of obscenity, whereas Books 6 and 7, although they contain about as many imperial poems as Book 5, are not.[90] The avoidance of obscenity is obviously linked to the dedication to the emperor, and may correspond to express demands from the court. But it may also have to do with Martial's own estimation of what would be admissible. Moreover, the circumstance that he does not structurally give up obscenity again suggests a manoeuvring poet, continuously testing the waters and trying to remain true to himself while not offending the emperor. A model of negotiation may fit the situation better than a model of compliance with instructions.

In the case of Statius, there is one passage which until recently has always been taken as indicating that he received a command to write for Domitian; however, it has been convincingly argued that the transmitted text of this passage is corrupt precisely in the word meaning "command"[91]. As it stands in M, the manuscript of the *Silvae* from which all others derive, the passage reads as follows:

> Centum hos uersus, quos in ecum maximum feci, indulgentissimo imperatori postero die quam dedicauerat opus tradere iussum. (*Silv.* 1.*ep.*17–19)

> These one hundred verses that I composed on the colossal equestrian statue, (I was) ordered to hand over to our most indulgent emperor on the day after he had dedicated the work.

Iussum ("ordered") is unsatisfactory both from a grammatical and a rhythmical point of view, but can easily be corrected either to *iussus sum* or to *est iussum*, both yielding the meaning "I was ordered".[92]

---

[90] Although one may in individual cases differ as to what should count as an "imperial poem", the distributional patterns are clear and undisputed; see for statistics e.g. Coleman1998a: 339 and Henriksén 1998–99: 1.22.

[91] See Håkanson 1969: 17–18.

[92] Among the most current editions before Courtney's, Vollmer and Mozley (Loeb) read *iussus sum*, Klotz, Frère (Budé) and Marastoni *est issum*, which gives a better clausula.

The following sentence, however, will fit neither of these readings: "'Possibly,' somebody will say, 'you could have seen it in advance'" (1.*ep.*19–20). If Statius had received the order for the poem on the day of the dedication of the statue[93], what point would there be in the objection that he could have *seen* the statue beforehand? His speed of composition would have been nothing the less remarkable for that. But the objection would be perfectly reasonable if Statius had taken the initiative himself: in that case, if he had seen the statue beforehand, he could have started composing (or planning) beforehand. And there is a smooth emendation giving precisely the right word for poet's initiative: Sandström's *ausus sum*, meaning "I dared to"[94]. There can be no doubt as to the truth of this conjecture[95], so that the evidence for imperial initiative turns into its opposite. We may now look if that consequence is confirmed by other evidence from the *Silvae*. Unfortunately, this evidence is neither copious nor very telling.

In the preface to Book 2, Statius again emphasises that his poem for the emperor has been written as quickly as his compositions for other patrons:

> Eandem exigebat stili facilitatem leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo imperatori ni statim tradere. (2.*ep.*16–18)

> The same fluency was demanded by the poem on the tame lion, who was laid low in the amphitheatre: it would have been pointless to hand it over to our most sacred emperor other than at once.

---

[93] On the reading *iussus sum* or *est iussum*, the temporal adjunct *postero die quam dedicauerat opus* must belong to *tradere*, not to the main verb, in spite of the indicative *dedicauerat*; cf. Håkanson 1969: 17.

[94] Håkanson 1969: 18 notes that *audere* is doubly appropriate: with respect to the dedicatee (for which he compares Mart. 6.1.4–5) and with respect to the speed of composition (for which he compares *audacter* somewhat further on in 1.*ep.* (22); one might add *audacia* at 3.*ep.*4). Moreover (as was already noted by Sandström), *indulgentissimo* is much more fitting with *ausus sum* than with *iussus sum* or *est iussum*. Finally, the problem with the mood of *dedicauerat* (cf. n. 93) disappears, and the clausula is good.

[95] Håkanson's defence was rejected (or ignored) e.g. by Ahl 1984a: 91 and Coleman 1986: 3100, but accepted by Hardie 1983: 131. The conjecture is printed by Courtney 1990, and has again been defended by Geyssen 1996: 27–30.

Statius' wording implies that he wrote on his own initiative: he responded promptly not because he had been ordered to do so, but because otherwise his gesture would have lost its appropriateness.

The remaining imperial poem from Books 1–3, poem 1.6, likewise describes events in the amphitheatre from an eye-witness perspective, in this case a spectacular feast given by Domitian to the populace. Unfortunately, the text of the preface to Book 1 is lost at the crucial point, but a reconstruction of the text along the lines of what Statius says about poem 2.5 is at least perfectly possible[96].

Book Four begins with a cluster of imperial poems, all on grand, official occasions: Domitian's assumption of his seventeenth consulship (4.1), a ceremonial meal given to senators and knights (4.2), and the inauguration of an important new road (4.3). The vocabulary Statius uses in the preface suggests that the initiative was his own, but the terms in question are far from conclusive: "I adored … I offered thanks … I admired …" (*adoraui ... gratias egi ... miratus sum*: 4.*ep*.6–7). Nor do the poems themselves contain explicit information on the circumstances of composition and delivery. So one's view of initiative will be conditioned by the opinions one entertains about the *functions* of the poems. Thus, once Alex Hardie argues of *Silvae* 4.1 that "it might have been a signal, a preparing of the ground ... before Domitian had made his intentions clear", he is all but compelled to the conclusion that "the poet had to make his points ... almost certainly on the basis of careful briefing"[97]. Discussion of function properly belongs to Chapter 9, but at this point a consideration of Hardie's views on *Silvae* 4.1 may help to illustrate the kind of problems which arise around the question of initiative.

When Domitian assumed his seventeenth consulship in 95 (after having refused the honour in the two preceding years), part of his purpose was to introduce to public life his newly adopted sons, the two sons of Flavius Clemens[98]. In this, he followed the example of Augustus, who had assumed consulships in the years in which his adopted sons Gaius and Lucius Caesar had turned fifteen (5 B.C.E. and 2 B.C.E.), "in order to be endowed with the highest office when

[96] See p. 362.
[97] Hardie 1983: 192–94 (quotations from 192 and 194).
[98] Cf. e.g. B.W. Jones 1992: 47–48.

leading each of them into the Forum upon their introduction into public life" (Suet. *Aug.* 26.2). Now it is precisely these two consulships of Augustus which Statius singles out in his comparison with Domitian (32), and this has moved Hardie to his hypothesis of "a preparing of the ground". But what ground was there to prepare? The adoption was a fact (Suet. *Dom.* 15.1), and Domitian had made his intentions sufficiently clear by selecting Flavius Clemens as his colleague in the consulate. Statius would have needed no "briefing" for the parallel with Augustus, and the obliqueness with which it is drawn must imply that it was well-known[99].

A similar argument will deal with the prominence Statius accords to the god Janus. The poet needed no instructions for doing this. Janus presided over the beginning of the year, and was therefore firmly associated with the entrance into office of new consuls on the first of January ("his" month)[100]. Moreover, Domitian had been building a new temple to Janus Quadrifrons, which had been making an impression: it is celebrated by Martial in a poem from January 93 (8.2), and selected by Statius in a another poem (from 95) as the first item in a laudatory paraphrase for Domitian:

> qui limina bellicosa Iani
> iustis legibus et foro coronat (4.3.9–10)
>
> who crowns the thresholds of warlike Janus with just laws and a forum

The forum is the new Forum Transitorium, alongside the Temple of Peace[101]. This location is obviously significant, because the temple of Janus was closed in times of peace, a custom alluded to by Martial in a later poem on the Janus Quadrifrons and the Forum Transitorium

---

[99] The entire section 28–43 elaborates a number of further parallels with Augustus: a great number of consulships (28–37), celebration of Secular Games (37–38), (expected) triumphs over Eastern peoples (39–42), honorific names of months (42–43); in all cases Domitian surpasses Augustus (cf. van Dam 1992: 195–97). But these parallels, too, were obvious.

[100] Cf. *Silv.* 4.2.61 *saepe nouo Ianum lictore salutes*, and the description of January 1st in Ov. *Fast.* 1, esp. 81–82 (cf. also Luc. 5.5–6). Martial employed Janus in his congratulations on a consulate (8.66, 11.4), as did Ovid (*Pont.* 4.4.23–26; cf. 4.9.57–60).

[101] The precise location, appearance, and history of the temple of Janus Quadrifrons in the Forum Transitorium is contested; cf. e.g. Holland 1961: 92–102, Richardson 1992: 208–09, Darwall-Smith 1996: 115–24.

(10.28.7–8)[102]. So it is unsurprising that Statius in *Silvae* 4.1 also refers to this temple and gives the same interpretation of its location[103]:

> Ianus ..., quem tu uicina Pace ligatum
> omnia iussisti componere bella nouique
> in leges iurare fori (4.1.13–15)
>
> Janus ..., whom bound to nearby Peace, you have ordered to settle all wars and to swear obedience to the laws of the new forum

Like Martial, all Statius had to do was to give verbal form to a message already unambiguously expressed in urban design, architecture, and ceremony.

The situation may perhaps be characterised by the paradoxical formula "indirect direction": no orders or instructions were issued, but nevertheless the poets were being made aware of what would be appreciated. "Indirect direction" is built-in in the system of patronage itself: the patron rewards some poems more highly than others, and in that manner influences the direction the poetic production takes. More importantly, in the case of imperial patronage, the poets are guided by the imperial image such as it is projected in other media; in some cases, such as urban planning and ceremony, these were subject to conscious direction from the court (if not from the emperor himself), in other cases, such as sculpture and probably coinage, they were themselves the products of complex negotiations be-

[102] On the closing of the temple of Janus cf. Syme 1979 = *RP* 3.1179–97. Syme (206 = 3.1193) puts Mart. 10.28 in 95 (likewise Coleman 1988: 69), but since Martial removed all poems honouring Domitian from the second edition of Book 10 (the edition we have), this cannot be correct. The poem must have been written under Nerva, who dedicated the temple of Minerva (or perhaps the forum itself; cf. Aur. Vict. 12.2) at the end of 97 (*CIL* 6.953 and 31213); thus L. Friedländer 1886: 2.123 and Gsell 1893: 105, n. 6.

[103] In the surrounding lines (11–16), Statius evidently describes the old shrine of Janus Geminus in front of the Curia. This can be explained if the old shrine was not yet demolished (cf. Coleman 1988: 69–71) or was not to be demolished at all (cf. Darwall-Smith 1996: 121–22). The reason that it is evoked here might then be that Janus Geminus was topographically in a better position to address the new consul emerging from the Curia (cf. 10) than Janus Quadrifrons.

tween subjects honouring the emperor and emperors accepting, refusing or modifying these honours[104].

But the conclusion here tentatively derived from *Silvae* 4.1, that the poet wrote on his own initiative, will be put into jeopardy once the view is accepted that Statius recited his poem on some kind of official ceremony: it is hardly conceivable that he just rose and started disclaiming, without having been asked to do so. The commentators are silent on this count with regard to *Silvae* 4.1, but with regard to 4.2 and 4.3 they do suppose ceremonial performance[105]. Discussion of this question, however, belongs to the following chapter.

[104] Statues of the emperor were not put up by the emperor himself, but by his subjects (see Pekáry 1985 for details), yet an emperor could refuse statues that did not meet certain requirements. Thus Domitian accepted only statues in gold or silver (Suet. *Dom.* 13.2; cf. B.W. Jones 1996: 110–11), a policy which was immediately reversed by Nerva (D.C. 68.2.1) and Trajan (Plin. *Pan.* 52.3). On the question in how far the coinage reflects propaganda devised by and in how far honours paid to the emperor, see Bergmann 1998: 91–98.

[105] Cf. Coleman 1988: 83–84 (on 4.2) and 105 (on 4.3), Vessey 1983: 207 (on 4.2).

CHAPTER EIGHT

MODES OF RECEPTION OF POETRY FOR THE EMPEROR

The poems contained in the *Silvae* of Statius and the *Epigrams* of Martial have survived because they were published, but in many cases an earlier reception had preceded publication in book form. Thus, in the preface to his first book, Statius tells his readers that he has hesitated a long time before deciding to publish poems already given to various addressees (1.*ep.*1–11)[1]. Among these addressees, the emperor occupies a special position, as Statius intimates in the preface to Book 4, where he remarks: "many of them [*scil.* his previous poems] I had already given to my lord the emperor, and how much more is that than publishing!" (4.*ep.*28–29). Whatever he means precisely—and that will have to be investigated—, it is clear that he attaches great importance to the offering of poetry to the emperor prior to publication. One can imagine two forms this could have taken: recitation and the gift of a manuscript. These two possibilities will now be discussed in this order; afterwards book publication will be dealt with.

Oral Presentation

At the end of the previous chapter, it turned out that the hypothesis (cautiously) defended there, absence of imperial initiative, is dependent on another hypothesis, to be (cautiously) defended here: absence of ceremonial recitation; because the discussion was tied to *Silvae* 4.1–3, I will begin by considering this group of poems. The preface to Book 4 does not offer unambiguous evidence, so the analysis will have to focus on the text of the poems themselves.

As in Chapter 5, the aspect of the text that will be looked at is its *deixis*, i.e. its use of linguistic elements whose reference is dependent on the context of utterance[2]. Examples are to be found among ad-

---

[1] On this passage see p. 249.

[2] See p. 258.

verbs of time and place ("here", "there", "now", "then"), personal pronouns ("I", "you"), demonstrative pronouns ("this", "that", if these do not refer to elements in the utterance itself), and verbal categories such as person, number and tense. From an analysis of such elements, one can work one's way back to a reconstruction of the context of utterance presupposed by the text. Now quite often it appears that the deictic elements in the text are contradictory, e.g. between the present and the past. In such a case we have to conclude that part of the deixis is fictional, e.g. that the text was really written after the event (past deixis), but partly employs the fiction that it was performed on the occasion itself (present deixis), either in order to suggest that this really was the case or just in order to achieve greater immediacy. But non-contradictory deixis may be fictional as well: even if a poem consistently presents itself as being performed on a certain occasion, this may be a construct engineered by the poem. More generally, as long as we have only a text, this text may always be fictional; it is only circumstantial evidence of various kinds that may allow us to draw conclusion about the textual practices of the author and the recipients of the text.[3]

I will begin with *Silvae* 4.1, in which Statius congratulates Domitian on his seventeenth consulship. The poem refers to Domitian in the third person (1–4), but also addresses him in the second (13–15, 46–47), and describes the occasion in the present tense; the speech of the god Janus is introduced with a word meaning "look!" (*ecce*: 15). Of course an apparition of a god is always fictional, but fictional content does not necessarily imply fictional deixis, in the sense that a fictional context of utterance is constructed by the text. Statius could have continued after the report of the speech: "Janus has done, and withdraws into his temple. And lo! signs appear in the heavens", etc. But he does not, and breaks the consistency of the deixis by using the perfect tense ("signs appeared", etc.: 44–47). So the text must be thought of as spoken after Janus' presumed apparition. Yet this moment may still be situated during the festivities, and it is conceivable that Statius presented his text (fictional deixis and all) in a spoken

[3] Fowler 1995: 40 rightly notes "No feature of a text can ever establish ... an external context because all features *may* [my emphasis] be imitated in a wholly fictional context", but he fails to discuss the role of outside evidence; cf. p. 39, n. 5.

address to Domitian. But if he did, on what sort of occasion? In any case not during the ceremony in the Senate House, because non-senatorial speakers cannot be imagined there[4]. Other stages in the festivities could be proposed, e.g. the sacrifice on the Capitol[5], but one would have expected at least some indication of the setting; as it is, any deixis tying the poem to a specific context of utterance has been avoided. So the balance of probability inclines towards absence of ceremonial recitation.

In *Silvae* 4.2, where Statius thanks the emperor for having been invited to a banquet at the Palace, the deixis is even less consistent than in 4.1. On the one hand we find that Domitian is addressed in the second person (14–17, 21–22, 52–67) and that the occasion is described in the present tense (10–17, 32–35) and indicated by words meaning "this", "here", "now" (13, 16, 32). On the other hand the emperor is referred to in the third person (5–6, 25–26, 32–33) and—more importantly—the meal is treated as a thing of the past (40–44, 63), which would be unthinkable when the poem was recited on the occasion itself[6]. The conclusion must be that Statius employs the *fiction* of ceremonial address (though not consistently) in order to achieve greater immediacy and rhetorical effect: "I *am* overwhelmed" is more convincing than "I *was* overwhelmed", because the latter expression can be used any time, whereas the former can be uttered only at the moment one is, indeed, overwhelmed. Similarly, second-person address is more intense than third-person description: "I admire *him*" is oriented toward the audience, whereas "I admire *you*" is oriented toward the person addressed, and "forgets" the audi-

---

[4] At the inauguration ceremony in the Senate House, the incoming consul addressed a *gratiarum actio* to the emperor: see Ov. *Pont.* 4.4.35–39, *Laus Pis.* 68–71, Plin. *Pan.* with *Ep.* 3.13 and 18; on Fronto cf. Champlin 1980: 83–86. In *Silv.* 4.1 the consul is not the one speaking, but the one being addressed; the speaker is not even a senator.

[5] Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 1.79–84. The temple of Janus does not seem to have played a role in the ceremonies.

[6] Coleman's idea that "if indeed, towards the end of the banquet, St. recited a poem of thanks to the emperor which was cast in the form of recollections after the event, that would have been a *tour de force* that must have appealed to the recipient" (Coleman 1988: 84) is not convincing: one cannot see the point of such a "*tour the force*", and, moreover, Statius' attempt would have to be considered a failure, because his poem is not cast *consistently* "in the form of recollections after the event".

ence. Second-person address can be a figure (apostrophe) rather than a reflection of the context of utterance[7].

But there is another consideration, which might seem to tell in favour of a truly symposiastic character of *Silvae* 4.2. At the beginning of the poem, Statius compares the feast organised by Domitian to the banquets given by Dido (1–2) and Alcinous (3–4), as immortalised in the *Aeneid* and the *Odyssey*, respectively. At both these banquets a bard performed: Iopas, who recited a didactic poem (*A.* 1.740–47), and Demodocus, who sang of the siege of Troy (*Od.* 8.72–82), the amours of Ares and Aphrodite (266–366), and again the siege of Troy (487–520). Yet, significantly enough, Statius does not compare himself to Iopas or Demodocus, but to Virgil and Homer, who sang of the banquet *itself* (as he does), and composed their poetry well after the event[8]. Later on in the poem, Statius makes another comparison in which he does mention symposiastic performers: he likens Domitian to Jupiter, when the latter relaxes at the tables of the Ethiopians and listens to songs sung by the Muses and Apollo (53–56). The theme of Apollo's song is Jupiter's victory over the Giants, and this provides a link with Statius celebrating Domitian's triumphs over the Germans and the Dacians. But Statius did not do this at the banquet, but at an entirely different occasion, recalled by himself: the poetry competition at Alba (63–67). So Statius' references to poets do give a series of approximations of his role as a poet, but without constructing a precise model of the context of utterance of the poem.

As for *Silvae* 4.3, on a road built by Domitian from Sinuessa (Mondragone) to Cumae (Cuma) and beyond to Puteoli (Pozzuoli), if this poem was recited, the occasion must have been the official inauguration of the road the poem celebrates[9]. However, the deixis does not identify such a ceremony. Instead, the "here"'s and "now"'s establish fictional situations. In the first sections of the poem, Statius

[7] For this analysis of apostrophe, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.67 (on Cicero): *illo enim modo* [2nd-person address] *pressit atque instituit, hoc* [3rd-person address] *tantum indicasset*. Further references on apostrophe in Lausberg 1989: § 762.

[8] Statius even extends the parallel so far as to attribute to Virgil the intention of *praising* Dido's banquet (*laudat*: 1).

[9] Cf. Coleman 1988: 105: "It is tempting to think that St.'s poem was intended as part of such a celebration".

writes as if the construction of the road is still in progress (1–26, 40–66)[10], but later on the work appears to have been finished (93–113); the transition is neatly managed by introducing the speech of the river Volturnus in the present tense (67–70), and after the speech picking up the narrative with a pluperfect: "Thus the river; at the same time a marbled tract had raised itself with an mighty ridge" (95–96); while Volturnus spoke, the road was completed. The present tense is then used for the description of the finished road, as well as for the apparition of the Sibyl with which the poem ends. Still, this fiction is not incompatible with delivery at an inauguration ceremony. But where would the delivery have taken place? One would think either at the beginning of the new road, at the arch at Sinuessa (cf. 97–102), or at its end, at Cumae (cf. 114–15)[11]. However, the deixis of the poem causes difficulties with both hypotheses. Sinuessa is "there" (101–04), not "here", and Cumae lies in the distance (114–16) before it becomes the place where the poet finds himself, overhearing the Sibyl's address to Domitian (esp. 128, 144). The context of utterance is not fixed, but moves southwards, following the course of a traveller coming down from Rome (although Sinuessa is treated after the river Volturnus). This makes delivery at a certain spot not impossible, but unlikely: it would be odd for a poet declaiming at Cumae to cry out, as Statius does: "whom do I see there, down at Cumae?" (114–16)[12].

Statius' technique of employing a fictional context of utterance which moves southward along the road could be explained in various ways. Perhaps the *uia Domitiana* had been inaugurated by a "royal progress" from Sinuessa to Cumae (and Puteoli); in that case Statius must have been in Domitian's retinue[13]. But the explanation may also

---

[10] In 27–39, however, the road is "now" (*nunc*: 36) completed.

[11] Actually the *uia Domitiana* continued to Puteoli (Coleman 1988: 102), and this makes a ceremony at Cumae somewhat unlikely. Statius may have treated Cumae as the end (*fine uiae* [114]) merely because it enabled him to finish his poem with an apparition of the Sibyl.

[12] Coleman 1988: 130 seems to suppose that 114–16 are to be construed as spoken in the forum in Cumae, but this cannot be reconciled with 115 *qua monstrat ueteres Apollo Cumas*.

[13] The best argument for an imperial progress is that the Sibyl addresses Domitian (who was addressed by Volturnus earlier in the poem) as if he had come to Cumae in person (124–63); however, she may be regarding the road as a numinous manifesta-

be of a more personal nature: Statius must have travelled along the new route when he went from Rome to Naples in the first half of 95[14], and the monuments and inscriptions along the way may have given him the idea of gratifying the emperor with a poetic celebration of what was apparently a prestige object[15]. It is no objection against this suggestion that Statius does not appeal to his own experiences (as he did in *Silvae* 4.2), but rather introduces an anonymous *uiator* (28, 101)[16]. The construction of the road, unlike the dinner invitation of Silv*ae* 4.2, was not a favour to Statius personally, but involved him as a subject of the emperor, just as the statue of 1.1 and the games of 1.6 and 2.5—and in those poems Statius' own experiences are not intrusive either.

Silvae 1.1, a description of an equestrian statue of Domitian, situates itself in front of the monument, and although it does not explicitly refer to a dedication ceremony, the good wishes with which the poem ends (99–107) would be appropriate at such a ceremony. Yet we know that the poem was not recited at the dedication: in the preface to Book 1 Statius states that he had handed the poem over to the emperor *after* the dedication (1.*ep.*17–19)[17]. The same verb "to hand over" (*tradere*) is also used by Statius when referring to *Silvae* 2.5[18]:

> leo mansuetus, quem in amphitheatro prostratum frigidum erat sacratissimo imperatori ni statim tradere. (2.*ep.*16–18)

---

tion of his presence. I am not aware of any independent evidence about the inauguration of Roman roads.

[14] Book 4 of the *Silvae* was sent from Naples in the summer of 95, but Statius had spent the winter of 94–95 in Rome; see p. 204. The *uia Domitiana* was inaugurated in 95: D.C. 67.14.1.

[15] Coleman 1988: 110 notes an interesting coincidence between Statius' statement that Domitian had moved Campania closer to Rome (cf. 26 *admouere*) and an inscription found at Puteoli: ... *colonia Flauia Aug(usta) Puteoleana ... indulgentia maximi diuinique principis urbi eius admota* (*AE* 1973, 137 = 1941, 73).

[16] It is misleading to call *Silv.* 4.3 an "Erlebnisbericht über eine Reise des Dichters", as does Cancik 1965: 112 (cf. also 32).

[17] On the text and interpretation of *Silv.* 1.*ep.*17–19 see p. 350. Statius' poem in a sense re-enacts the ceremony, but it was not "written for an occasion" (Hardie 1983: 131) or "written for the statue's dedication" (Geyssen 1996: 21).

[18] This text has already been quoted at p. 351.

> the poem on the tame lion, who was laid low in the amphitheatre: it would have been pointless to hand it over to our most sacred emperor other than at once.

The expression "at once" (*statim*) might seem to imply that the poem was written and handed over on the spot, but if so, we would have to assume that Statius had some kind of privileged access to the imperial box. So it is perhaps better to surmise that Statius used his access to the palace in the same way as he did on the occasion of *Silvae* 1.1, and offered the poem later on the same day or one or two days afterwards. The deixis is in accordance with such an hypothesis, because the event is described in the past tense, even though these are enlivened with an occasional "historic present" (11, 23). In any case, recitation can be excluded. It is incompatible with what we know of the acoustics of Roman amphitheatres in general and the Colosseum in particular: the elliptical form and the dimensions of the building, together with a number of other factors, made speech or song impossible[19].

This is relevant for Statius' other poem set in the Colosseum, *Silvae* 1.6. On this poem Statius' introductory remarks have survived only in part. In the context of trying to prove the reliability of his claim to quick composition (1.*ep*.13–14), Statius states:

> In fine sunt Kalendae Decembres, quibus utique creditur: noctem enim illam felicissimam et uoluptatibus publicis inexpertam ... (1.*ep*.30–32).

> At the end is the poem on the first of December, which finds belief in any case: for that night full of happiness, unprecedented for the joys of the people ...

The commentators supply something like "I publicly recited" or "I publicly sang"[20], but apart from the impossibility of recitation in the

---

[19] See Golvin 1988: 1.342 (and cf. 1.298 with n. 7). There are some references to emperors speaking with the audience in the amphitheatre, but this never involves more than a few words, supported by gestures (Suet. *Cl.* 21.5, *Tit.* 8.2). The normal means by which the emperors answered the acclamations of the crowds was by heralds or placards; see Millar 1992: 371–72.

[20] Vollmer 1898: 213 proposed *inexpertis* and then supplied *plenam in ipso amphitheatro sedens descripsi et palam recitaui*, Frère 1961: 1.13 kept *inexpertam* and suggested *quo tempore agebatur eo ipso palam cantaui*. Of course, after the remarks on 1.6 the letter would have ended with a renewed address to the dedicatee, as in Statius' other epistolary prefaces.

Colosseum, that makes no sense of *creditur* ("finds belief"): quick composition would have been demonstrated beyond doubt, so that there would have been no place left for an appeal to mere belief. It is more likely that Statius made a similar point as he did about *Silvae* 2.5[21]. Here too, the past tenses situate the poem after the event, even though they are interspersed with historic presents, and even though at the end of the poem Statius states that "now" he is sinking into a drunken stupor (96–97): an obvious fiction, which does not prevent him from adding a few lines foretelling immortal fame for the day (98–102).

If Statius did not recite at imperial ceremonies, there seems little chance that Martial did: at grand occasions one expects, if anything, longish panegyrics, not short epigrams. If we look at the deixis of epigrams celebrating such occasions, we find that a number of poems employ the present tense (or the future tense, to express good wishes), sometimes together with words meaning "here", or with an address to the emperor or to another element of the presumed context[22]. But we also find poems which mix present and past tenses[23], as well as poems which consistently situate the event celebrated in the past, sometimes with the additional help of pointers like "recently" (*modo*)[24]. In one case the same event, the unexpected warlike behaviour of deer in the amphitheatre, is reported in the past tense in one epigram (4.35), but in the present tense, with address to Domi-

---

[21] So one would have to think of something along the lines of *ingratum erat sacratissimo imperatori ni statim tradere.*

[22] See e.g. 4.3 (on an occurrence during games; also *aspice*), 6.13 (address to [a statue of] Julia), 7.1–2 (on a cuirass for Domitian, with address to Domitian [1] and the cuirass [2]), 8.21 (to the morning star, on Domitian's return from the Sarmatians; cf. L. Watson 1998), 8.26 (on games given to celebrate the victory over the Sarmatians, with address to Domitian), 8.65 (on a temple and a triumphal arch; "here", with address to Domitian), 9.1 (on the *Templum Gentis Flauiae*; good wishes), 9.20 (on the *Templum Gentis Flauiae*; "here", with address to Domitian), 9.64–65 and 101 (on a statue of Hercules with the features of Domitian, with in 65 address to Hercules and in 101 to the via Appia, where the statue stood).

[23] See e.g. 8.11, 8.30 (first *nunc*, present tenses and *aspicis ut*, then past tenses), 8.78, all on games given to celebrate the victory over the Sarmatians.

[24] See e.g. 8.2 and 8 (address to Janus, but Domitian's return described in the past tense), 8.26 (on games), 8.53 (55) (on games). Of these 8.2 and 8.53 (55) use *modo*; cf. 4.2, 5.3, 12.8.

tian, in another (4.74). The "presential" deixis is here fictional, as it may well be elsewhere. Moreover, epigram as a genre is at home not at public happenings, but at private symposia[25].

Did Martial perform, then, at the emperor's dinner-parties? Not often, in any case, for otherwise he would not have relied so much on freedmen as brokers, e.g. on Euphemus, whom he asks to introduce his epigrams at the imperial table (4.8)—his epigrams, not himself[26]. Yet Martial must have been a guest sometimes, at a few of the elaborate state banquets that Domitian occasionally offered to the populace[27], and occasionally he describes such a banquet from the viewpoint of a participant. An example is to be found in the following lines, on a meal given on the occasion of Domitian's victorious return from the Sarmatians in 93[28]:

> tanta tuas, Caesar, celebrant conuiuia laurus;
> exhilarant ipsos gaudia nostra deos.
> Vescitur omnis eques tecum populusque patresque
> et capit ambrosias cum duce Roma dapes. (8.49 [50].5–8)

> so great, Caesar, is the feast that celebrates your laurels; our joys cheer the gods themselves. With you dine all the knights, the people, the senators; together with its leader Rome partakes of an ambrosial repast.

The first person, the present tense, and the address to Domitian all point to delivery at the meal itself. In this case, the probability that the context of utterance constructed by the deixis is real rather than fictional is greater than in the case of non-sympotic epigrams, because symposia sometimes admitted epigrams. This appeal to the pragmatics of the genre is, however, not conclusive, and it should be emphasised that the hypotheses suggested in this chapter on the absence or presence of recitation must remain highly provisional.

---

25 See pp. 96–105.

26 On imperial freedmen as brokers see pp. 345–349.

27 See Suet. *Dom.* 7.1: *sportulas publicas sustulit, reuocata rectarum cenarum consuetudine*, and cf. D'Arms 1984: 341–44 (repeated in D'Arms 1990: 309–10), Murison 1999: 227, Winterling 1999: 157–58.

28 It is possible that 8.39, which also has "presential" deixis, concerns the same occasion. *Silvae* 4.2, however, dates from at least a year later.

Presentation in Writing

We have just seen that Statius in his prefaces specifies that he had "handed over" poems 1.1. and 2.5 (and perhaps 1.6) to the emperor (using the verb *tradere*). These statements are repeated and summarised in the preface to Book 4, where Statius writes that he had "given" many of his earlier poems to the emperor before publication (using the verb *dare*: 4.*ep*.28). "Many" is exaggerated for three poems[29], but perhaps Statius was already thinking of the imperial poems in Book 4 itself, which, like his other imperial poems, he may well have handed over to the emperor before including them in the published *Silvae*.

It is likely that Martial, too, offered single poems to the emperor before publication, just as he did to non-imperial addressees[30]. An example might be the first epigram of the fourth book, a congratulation on Domitian's birthday, the 24th of October; Book 4 was published on the Saturnalia in December, and the poem would have been at least two months late if its original reception occurred only then[31]. But there are few other convincing cases, and it will be more worthwhile to ask whether Martial offered collections, rather than single poems, to the emperor.

In Chapter 2 it has been argued that the widespread assumption that Martial offered collections to non-imperial addressees before publication cannot be upheld: all epigrams presenting an addressee with a collection turned out to refer to the published book itself[32]. A quick survey of the texts presenting a collection to the emperor will show that these, too, invariably concern the published book[33]: they stand at or near its beginning (1.4–5, 4.8, 5.1, 5.5, 5.6, 6.1, 8.*ep*. + 8.1) or at its very end (7.99, 8.82); sometimes the book number is mentioned (6.1, 8.*ep*.), or the physical appearance of the manuscript

---

[29] Cf. p. 374.

[30] On single poems given to non-imperial addressees cf. p. 107.

[31] This argument was formulated by White 1974: 40. The date of Domitian's birthday is known from Suet. *Dom.* 1.1; on the date of Book 4 cf. p. 110.

[32] Cf. pp. 109–120.

[33] A more detailed argumentation is to found in Citroni 1988. I leave out of account 12.4 (5) and 12.11, which introduce an anthology from Books 10 and 11 offered to Nerva.

being offered is described in terms appropriate to a published roll (5.6)[34]; some of the poems are apologetic (1.4–5, 4.8), which fits a published book better than a collection which could have been keyed to the tastes of the emperor; other poems refer to the glory Domitian derives from the success of Martial's books (7.99, 8.82). So we do not find, in the *corpus* of Martial's numbered books, poems which originally introduced a smaller collection to the emperor. But there is some other evidence for such collections.

Martial's first book includes an epigram in which he mourns the death of his young slave secretary Demetrius, whom he introduces as follows:

> Illa manus quondam studiorum fida meorum
>   et felix domino notaque Caesaribus (1.101.1–2)
>
> Once the trusted secretary of my studies, he whose handwriting brought good fortune to his master and was known to the Caesars

Martial claims that both Titus and Domitian have actually read (with their own eyes) manuscripts which he had offered them. In principle, it would be possible that these manuscripts were published books, because when an author sent someone a published book, he sent a copy prepared in his own household, not a booksellers' copy[35]. But at the time this epigram was written, Martial's only published books were the so-called *Liber spectaculorum*, the *Xenia* and the *Apophoreta*[36]. The *Liber spectaculorum* had been offered to Titus, but the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta* carry no dedications; it is unlikely that Martial had sent copies to Domitian, even if the presence of flattering

---

[34] The roll is impregnated with cedar oil, protected by a purple wrapper, and wound around a cylinder with protruding knobs. Cf. 3.2 and 8.61 for the cedar oil and the knobs, as well as 1.117 and 11.1 for the purple wrapper; at 1.66 absence of knobs and wrapper connotes unpublished condition. See further p. 130 with n. 129.

[35] See p. 129.

[36] Because Demetrius died at the age of nineteen (4) and because he cannot have been much younger than fourteen when he wrote his manuscripts for Titus, the *terminus ante quem* of the poem is some five years after the death of Titus, i.e. around 86, which is the date of the first edition of Book 1. Because of this, the suggestion of Fowler 1995: 46 that the poem should be interpreted in the light of the second edition in codex form (which was much later: see Appendix) is impossible.

epigrams may suggest that he reckoned with the emperor as reader[37]. So Martial is probably referring to other unpublished manuscripts, but these might have been single epigrams just as well as collections.

Martial does speak of collections, however, in a poem from Book 2 (addressing Domitian):

> si festinatis totiens tibi lecta[38] libellis
> detinuere oculos carmina nostra tuos (2.91.3–4)

> if indeed my poems, so often read by you in hurried little books, have detained your eyes

The plural and the word "so often" (*totiens*) make it unlikely that the reference of the word "little books" (*libelli*) is to Martial's published books (of which there had been only one, again excepting the *Liber spectaculorum, Xenia* and *Apophoreta*)[39]. This inference is supported by the word "hurried", which can only be understood if the "little books" were written in response to specific occasions, which demanded to be celebrated on the spot[40]. Martial had earlier used this word in the final distich of the so-called *Liber spectaculorum*, a collection written to celebrate the inauguration of the Amphitheatrum Flavium (or Colosseum) by Titus in 80[41]:

> Da ueniam subitis: non displicuisse meretur,
> festinat, Caesar, qui placuisse tibi. (*Spect.* 35 [31 (32)])

---

[37] Flattering epigrams: 13.4, 74, 91, 109, 127 (the last epigram in the book, with a direct address to Domitian); 14.1, 34, 73, 124, 170, 179.

[38] With Citroni 1988: 5, n. 4 = 1996: 9, n. 4 I retain *tibi lecta* as against Shackleton Bailey's conjecture *collecta* (1978: 275; cf. 1980: 69), but the question does not affect my argument, which is dependent on *libelli*.

[39] Other epigrams where Domitian is supposed to read Martial's *libelli* do refer to the published books: cf. 4.27, 6.64, 7.12, and the dedication poems discussed above.

[40] See Citroni 1988: 4–6 = 1996: 7–11. If 2.91 is from the very beginning of Domitian's reign, as Citroni argues, reference to unpublished collections is even more undeniable. The suggestion of Fowler 1995: 45 that the poem should be interpreted in the light of the codex edition, entails a date very late in the reign (cf. n. 36), which is implausible; cf. p. 336.

[41] The work survives incomplete and without a title; of the modern titles, *Liber spectaculorum* is the most convenient; see Carratello 1980: 33–35, Coleman 1988b: 15, n. 1. Shackleton Bailey 1993: 39, n. *b* supposes that this distich does not belong in the book, but cf. Reeve 1980: 199–200 and 1983: 241–42 on the transmission, and Weinreich 1928: 24–28 on its being the concluding distich of the concluding epigram.

Pardon my hasty work: non one deserves to displease, who hurries, Caesar, to please you.

Here we have an example of an occasional collection offered to an emperor. It was not incorporated into a later book, but presumably put into circulation by Titus as its dedicatee, either through placing copies in public libraries or through giving copies to friends or even to booksellers[42]. But in the numbered books of Martial's *corpus*, we sometimes find "cycles" of occasional poems which are reminiscent of the *Liber spectaculorum*, and the thought suggests itself that these had originally been offered as separate collections to Domitian[43].

The first of these cycles is the so-called "lions-hares-cycle" on a curious feat of animal training recently exhibited at Domitian's games: lions had pursued hares and taken them in their jaws, but then let them go (1.6, 14, 22, 48, 51, 60, 104)[44]. In the midst of the cycle comes an epigram which comments on it:

Lasciuos leporum cursus lususque leonum
  quod maior nobis charta minorque gerit
et bis idem facimus, nimium si, Stella, uidetur
  hoc tibi, bis leporem tu quoque pone mihi. (1.44)

The merry running of hares and playing of lions is included in my larger and my smaller book-roll: I have done the same thing twice. If you think that this is too much, Stella, you too can serve hare twice.

The most widespread interpretation of this epigram is that Martial refers to two unpublished collections, a larger and a smaller one, both offered to Stella, which both contained poems from the lions-hares-cycle; Stella would then evince surprise that Martial included

---

[42] On publication by the dedicatee in ancient Rome see pp. pp. 120–124 and 282. Coleman 1998b: 32–34 suggests that Titus used the infrastructure of the imperial administration to distribute large amounts of copies throughout the empire, but there is no parallel for such a practice; the passage she adduces from Joseph's' autobiography (*Vit.* 363) means no more than that Titus ordered to "publish" (δημοσιῶσαι, vv. ll. δημοσιεῦσαι, δημοσιέυεσθαι) Josephus' *Jewish War*; cf. LSJ s.v. δημοσιόω II.1 and δημοσιέυω I.2.

[43] Outside Martial, one might adduce the series of eight epigrams in the *Anthologia Latina* on the triumph of Claudius over Britannia: *AL* 417–24 SB (on which cf. Tandoi 1962–63).

[44] The cycle is very carefully constructed; see Weinreich 1928: 90–112, Barwick 1958: 291–92.

variations on the same motif in two different collections[45]. But varying the same motif is neither surprising nor can it be described as "doing the same thing"; that expression must refer to including the same poem or poems from the lions-hares-cycle in two collections. If these were unpublished ones, presented to Stella, the epigram would not be intelligible to other readers, and not fulfil its obvious function of commenting on the lions-hares-cycle as published in Book 1. So the "larger collection" must be Book 1 itself, and the "smaller collection" must have had some notoriety among the reading public. That would have been the case if the lions-hares-cycle had been offered as a collection to the emperor and had subsequently come into circulation (just as the *Liber spectaculorum* had come into circulation)[46]. Stella's function would then be to articulate the surprise of Martial's readers at finding the collection republished in Book 1. Their surprise would be all the more understandable if the lions-hares-cycle were the *only* instance of republication; if it was Martial's praxis throughout the book to include poems from earlier "private" collections, Stella's objection to one specific instance would be somewhat pointless. So this epigram confirms that no informal collections were offered to non-imperial patrons; on the other hand it does suggest that such collections were sometimes offered to the emperor, and that they consisted of laudatory epigrams on the occasion of some memorable event.

The interpretation here offered needs to be tested against the following epigram, which obviously forms a pair with its predecessor[47].

> Edita ne breuibus pereat mihi cura libellis,
> dicatur potius: "Τὸν δ'ἀπαμειβόμενος". (1.45)

---

[45] Thus i.a. L. Friedländer 1886: 1.192, White 1974: 46, Citroni 1975: 145–47 (with a survey of other proposals), Howell 1980: 206–07, and Shackleton Bailey 1993: 1.72–73, with n. *b*.

[46] This is a modification of the views of Weinreich 1928: 103–08, who thinks the smaller collection had been offered to Stella as well as to Domitian, and Prinz 1929: 112–13, who thinks of a collection (or rather of various collections) of mixed epigrams. Both do not draw the parallel with the *Liber spectaculorum*.

[47] Both epigrams were often taken to constitute a single composition (e.g. by Weinreich 1928: 108–09), but Prinz 1929: 111–12 rightly observed that each has its own *pointe*.

> Rather than that my work, published in short little books, should perish, let people say: "To him in answer".

"To him in answer" is a Homeric formula, which occurs over 70 times in the *Iliad* and the *Odessa* (110 times if one includes "to her in answer"); the comic poet Cratinus made fun of it as an instance of Homeric self-repetition[48]. Most commentators make Martial himself use the expression ("let *me* say: ..."); they think that he declares himself prepared to accept endless repetition out of fear that otherwise his books would not be long enough to survive[49]. But length is not at issue: Martial quite often speaks of his "short little books", and always considers their brevity beneficial, not detrimental, to his success[50]. Moreover, it would not be like him to talk of the prized art of motif variation in terms of mechanical repetition. The epigram can be better understood if it is taken, like 1.44, to refer to the repeated publication of the same texts. Offering a collection to someone amounted to publishing it (in the sense of giving it out of one's hand: *edere*)[51]; therefore, "my work, published in short little books" could refer both to smaller collections offered to the emperor and to Book 1 itself. Martial was well aware that books might "perish" (*perire*), if they were not read[52], and he is therefore prepared to publish the same epigrams in more than one book, even if this leads to the—exaggerated—criticism that he is repeating himself all the time[53].

---

[48] Cf. Porph. *ap.* Eus. *PE* 10.3.21: Ὁμήρου κωμῳδηθέντος ὑπὸ Κρατίνου διὰ τὸ πλεονάσαι ἐν τῷ τὸν δ'ἀπαμειβόμενος (Cratin. F 355 *PCG*).

[49] L. Friedländer 1886: 1. 192, seconded by Howell 1980: 207, prints a question mark at the end, and has Martial reject repetition; Citroni 1975: 147–49, Shackleton Bailey 1993: 1.72–73, with n. *c*, and Fowler 1995: 42 (i.a.) print a period and have him accept repetition.

[50] Cf. Mart. 2.1 (*succincti ... libelli, breuitate*), 2.6 (*macer libellus*), 4.82 (*breue ... opus*), 5.6 (*breuem ... chartam*), 8.24 (*gracili ... libello*), 10.1 (*libellus ... breuem*), 12.1 (*breui ... libello*), 12.4 (*breue ... opus*), 12.11 (*breuem ... libellum*).

[51] See p. 123.

[52] Cf. 1.113.6, of a bookseller who keeps Martial's juvenilia in stock: *per quem perire non licet meis nugis*; 7.51.8 of someone assiduously reciting Martial's books: *ut pereat chartis littera nulla meis*.

[53] This interpretation is close to that of Prinz 1929: 113–14 and Eden 1990: 162–63. Weinreich 1928: 108-09 puts a different construction upon τὸν δ'ἀπαμειβόμενος: because the phrase is used twice in the *Greek Anthology* with reference to reciprocity (11.125.4, 12.4.8), he takes it that Martial asks his readers

If the lions-hares-cycle was offered as a collection to Domitian before being included in Book 1, we may well ask whether other cycles of imperial poems likewise go back to smaller collections. With a "cycle" I mean, in accordance with conventional use, a group of interrelated poems; the term is not very precise, and has been much contested in studies of Martial[54]. I keep using it, because I am not here concerned with determining what exactly constitutes a "cycle", but only with the question whether such groups as can be distinguished may go back to unpublished collections. In that case we would have different modes of reception at the levels of presentation and of publication: at the level of publication the reading public found a series of poems artfully distributed among heterogeneous material, at the level of presentation the emperor had found the same series of poems, collected into a small roll and given to him in connection with the occasion they celebrated[55].

Outside the imperial poems we find cycles in Martial that certainly have been and cycles that certainly have not been previously used on an occasion. An example of the first category is the cycle on the dedication of the locks of Earinus[56], an example of the second category are the skoptic cycles, such as those on the plagiarist "Fidentinus" in Book 1 or on the unpleasant kisser "Postumus" in Book 2[57]. These may perhaps have functioned as entertainment at symposia before being published, but they cannot have formed the contents of manuscript collections offered to the addressees of the poems (who

---

for a reward; *ne ... pereat mihi cura* would then mean that Martial fears for the remuneration of his toil (not for the survival of his work). However, the link with 1.44 surely activates the associations of the Homeric phrase with repetition.

[54] It was introduced by Barwick 1958. Criticisms of his arbitrary use of the term and suggestions for greater rigour have come from i.a. Willenberg 1973: 321–24, Burnikel 1980: 87–94, Grewing 1997: 30–31, and Merli 1998: 139–44. Grewing and Merli chose to abandon the term altogether.

[55] Barwick 1958: 285 writes of poems in a cycle: "Trotzdem ist ihre Reihenfolge so sorgfältig abgewogen, als ob die Gedichte unmittelbar auf einander folgten"; if a cycle does indeed go back to an original collection, there the poems *would* have followed each other immediately.

[56] Mart. 9.11–13, 16–17, 36; perhaps 9.36 was added in the published book; cf. Henriksén 1998–99: 89–92.

[57] "Fidentinus": 1. 29, 38, 52, 53, 66; "Postumus": 2. 10, 12, 21–23. See Burnikel 1980: 88–90.

are fictional in any case). So we have to judge each imperial cycle on its merit.

The cycle in Book 5 on Domitian's revival of the *lex Roscia*, reserving the first fourteen rows of seats in the theatre to the equestrian order, contains no direct address to the emperor; the addressees are either the fictional butts of Martial's mockery (23, 27, 41) or friends of the poet in the "isolated vocative" (35, 38).In the cycle in Book 6 on Domitian's revival of the *lex Iulia*, forbidding adultery, we do find address to Domitian (2, 4), but also an isolated vocative (*Faustine* in 7) and addresses to fictional butts (22, 45, 91)[58]. Quite apart from the rather irreverent nature of both cycles, these patterns of address make it unlikely that they originally were collections specially written for Domitian.

The situation is different with the imperial poems in Books 7, 8, and 9. At the beginning of Book 7, we find two poems on Domitian's departure for the Sarmatians (1–2), and soon after these, four poems anticipating his return (5–8). Although the first of the return poems echoes the last of the departure poems[59], both groups belong to different occasions, which makes it unlikely that they originally formed part of the same collection. And although the emperor is addressed in each of the poems of the second group, this group cannot have been offered to him before publication, for the simple reason that he was not yet there: Book 7 was published in December 92, and Domitian's return occurred only in January 93.

The return is the major theme of the imperial poems in Book 8. But rather than group them all into one large cycle, one should observe the differences in theme and situation. A first group (2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 21) describes the return itself; it is unified by direct address to the emperor (4, 11, 15) and by recurrent motifs, such as the god Janus (2, 8) and the joys of the Roman people (4, 11, 15, 21). This group could conceivably have been offered as a collection to Domitian. But if such a collection existed, it may also have contained further poems now to be found in Book 8: on games (26, 30, 53 [55]), public dinners in the new palace (36, 39, 49 [50]), and the distribu-

---

58 For interpretation of both cycles see pp. 430–436.

59 The words *ducem ... redde togae* (7.2.8) are taken up by *gaudia uera togae,/ redde deum uotis* (7.5.2–3), as noted by Burnikel 1980: 91.

tion of money (56 [54])[60]. In some of these poems Martial explicitly makes the link with the theme of victory (26, 49 [50], 56 [54]); in the poems where he does not do so, he may likewise be describing events organised in connection with Domitian's victorious return. Such a connection is also present in the case of a triumphal arch erected near the temple of Fortuna Redux (65), but in this case the poem must have been significantly later, because the construction would have taken some time. At the end of the book we find two poems on games (78, 80), of which the first specifies that they have been given to celebrate the victory; because this poem is addressed to Stella as organiser of the games, and because of its position in the book, it is less likely that it and the other poem had belonged to a collection offered to Domitian.

The imperial poems in Book 9 are more heterogeneous than those in Book 8, and it makes even less sense to group them all into one all-encompassing "emperor cycle"[61]. The poems belong to number of different occasions, of which only two can conceivably have been settings for the presentation of a small collection to Domitian. The first is the dedication of the temple for the Flavian dynasty, the *Templum Gentis Flauiae*, which is the subject of three poems (1, 20, 34); but these poems have little in common, and the final one is of a rather light-hearted character, so that they would make up a rather slight collection. More convincing would be a collection consisting of the three poems concerned with the second occasion, the dedication of a temple for Hercules on the via Appia, with a colossal statue of the god bearing the features of Domitian (64–65, 101). These are longish poems, hanging closely together, and culminating in an impressive survey of Domitian's achievements (101). They would have made a fitting offering.

In summary, it must be said that we have found little evidence for collections of the type of the lions-hares-cycle having been given to Domitian before being included in the published book. The only possibilities are a collection on Domitian's victorious return form the

[60] Coleman 1998: 30 suggests that "seven poems scattered within Book 8 ... may have been presented at court in a separate format", but she does not specify which seven poems she is thinking of.

[61] Cf. Henriksén 1998–99: 1.16–19, criticising Barwick 1958 and Garthwaite 1993.

Sarmatians, either shorter (8. 2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 21) or longer (also 26, 30, 36, 39, 49 [50], 53 [56], 56 [54]), and a short collection on the temple of Hercules (9.64–65, 101). But even in these two cases, the pre-publication existence of the collections is merely hypothetical, and an alternative should be seriously considered: that Martial did offer smaller collections to the emperor before he started on his *corpus* of mixed epigrams (of which the lions-hares-cycle, included in the first book of that *corpus*, would be an example), but did not continue the practice, because from then on his published books were an adequate means for communication with the emperor.

Dedication and Publication

The relation between offering poems to the emperor and publishing them is the subject of a somewhat enigmatic remark by Statius in the preface to the fourth book of the *Silvae*. Speaking of the poems in the preceding three books, he claims:

> multa ex illis iam domino Caesari dederam, et quanto hoc plus est quam edere! (4.*ep*.28–29)
>
> many of them I had already given to my lord Caesar, and how much more is that than publishing!

Why is giving poems to the emperor "more" than publishing them? The most recent commentator suggests that the answer lies in "many": because there are only three poems addressed to the emperor in *Silvae* 1–3 (1.1, 1.6, 2.5), Statius must have given the emperor some non-imperial poems as well; these must have been "preview selections" submitted "for inspection"; so his meaning here must be that such inspection "is a more rigorous test of the poetry's worth than publication itself"[62]. But there is no evidence at all that there existed some kind of pre-publication censorship which was exercised by the emperor, and of which the poets could optionally avail themselves; moreover, in view of the way publication functioned in Ancient Rome, such a practice is highly unlikely[63]. It is

---

[62] Coleman 1988: 60; similarly already Coleman 1986: 3101–02.

[63] Cf. also my rebuttal of a related hypothesis about imperial guidance at pp. 349–355.

wiser to accept "many" as an exaggeration, and explain Statius' statement from the immediate context in which it occurs.

Statius is writing in answer to those "who have criticised, as I hear, that I have published this sort of writing" (4.*ep*.26–27). After the argument just quoted, Statius adduces another one: "But isn't it permissible to do exercises for fun?", with the retort of the fictional interlocutor: "'In private' comes the reply" (4.*ep*.29–30)[64]. The issues are seriousness and publicity: occasional poetry is only an inconsequential amusement, and should not, the adversary holds, be lifted out of its original setting of private communication. It is against this background that Statius' claim is to be understood: when poems are offered to the emperor, they are taken more seriously and treated as even less private than when they are published.

One aspect of the "seriousness" of publication is that the poet takes responsibility for collecting a number of smaller compositions in a roll of the size of a regular published book. Both Statius and Martial included poems for different addressees, and this raised for both of them the problem of the dedication of the book, as distinguished from the dedication of individual poems. Statius solved the problem by addressing a prose letter to one of the addressees, dedicating the book to him. Statius never dared to address such a letter to the emperor: all his books have non-imperial dedicatees. He did, however, pay his respects to the emperor by the way in which he ordered the poems in the book. At the very beginning of the *Silvae*, in Book 1, Statius put the dedicatee Stella in second place, putting a poem on the emperor first, and justified himself by appealing to a stock-phrase that had often been used to motivate initial position for the ruler: *a loue principium*, "from Jove the beginning" (1.*ep.* 17)[65]. The other imperial poem in Book 1 was put in the end, which was also a position of honour. In Book 2 Statius did not feel compelled to give special prominence to the single imperial composition in that book (2.5), perhaps because of the slightness of that poem, or be-

---

[64] Coleman's translation (1988: 5), reading *exerceri ioco* with Vollmer (*exercere ioco* M).

[65] The phrase is a translation by Virgil (*Ecl.* 3.60) of Aratus' expression Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα (1), which was applied to a ruler by Theocritus (17.1–4). Virgil's version was so applied by Germanicus in his translation of Aratus (*Arat.* 1–16) and by Calpurnius Siculus (*Ecl.* 4.82–86).

cause he thought that it was sufficient to have begun the collection *as such* with the emperor. But when, after having finished—as he thought—the *Silvae* with Book 3, he resumed the work with Book 4, he had to explain to the dedicatee Vitorius Marcellus that the poem addressed to him could only come in fourth place, because the book carried no less than three imperial poems, which had to take precedence (4.ep.1–5)[66]. So deference to the emperor forced Statius to break the rule that the addressee of the first poem in a collection was automatically to be considered the dedicatee.

When we turn to Martial, the situation is somewhat more complex, because Martial not only dedicates *poems* in one and the same book to different persons, but moreover dedicates *the book itself* to different persons[67]. In two cases one of the dedicatees is the emperor, and the dedication to him is privileged by being put in initial position. Book 5 opens with a poem accompanying the gift of the book to the emperor (5.1), followed by a declaration, addressed to the readers, that the book will contain no obscenity because it will be read by Domitian (5.2). There is a similar development at the beginning of Book 8, where the dedication is made by means of a prose letter, followed by an epigram. There too, Martial declares that the book will be less lascivious than usual out of respect for the emperor (8.*ep*., 1). So this type of dedication forced Martial to concessions with respect to those characteristics of his poetry to which he most owed his success[68].

But other books, too, begin with poems honouring the emperor, even if these poems do not offer the book to him[69]. Already in the *Xenia*, the first of the gifts described is connected with Domitian (13.4), as is the last (13.127). But in the *Apophoreta* this is not repeated, and the first edition of Book 1 of the *corpus* of mixed epigrams seems to have begun without reference to the emperor (1.3), although the second epigram is then addressed him as a potential

[66] On Statius' intention to end the *Silvae* with book 3, see p. 195; on the explanation given to Marcellus see p. 286 (where the passage is quoted).

[67] On multiple dedication in Martial see p. 129.

[68] On sexual explicitness as a ensuring popularity with the reading public cf. e.g. 1.*ep*.9–12, 1.35, 3.68 and 86, 7.25, 11.16.

[69] For Martial's treatment of the emperor at the beginning of his books see Merli 1993.

reader (1.4)[70]. Similarly in Book 2, after a prefatory letter to Decianus and an explanation of the character of the book, a panegyrical epigram follows. In Book 3 the Emperor is absent, which is to be explained from the circumstance that this book was put together at Forum Cornelii (Imola) in Cisalpine Gaul (3.1, 4), when Martial was disillusioned with the City and the Court. But from Book 4 onwards Domitian is always honoured at the very beginning. Book 4 itself opens with a congratulation on his birthday, followed by two other poems in his praise. Book 5, as we have seen, begins with a dedicatory epigram, and so does Book 6, but in the latter book the addressee is Julius Martialis, who is asked to correct it with great care, so that it may with more confidence come into the hands of the emperor. Book 7 opens with two poems which had accompanied a cuirass sent to Domitian in Sarmatia, Book 8 with the letter just mentioned, and Book 9 (after a private letter) with an epigram on the newly erected *Templum Gentis Flauiae*[71]. In the poems to Domitian's successors, who prided themselves on their aversion of adulation (cf. 10.72) the pattern is mitigated, but not abandoned: after dedicatory and prefatory material poems in honour of Nerva and Trajan have pride of place (10.6, 11.2, 12.4 [5]).

This short survey shows that some of these initial epigrams are reused from a previous communication with the emperor, but that others were specifically written for the published book. This is in accord with the result of the discussion on "emperor cycles", where it was proposed that at least some of them, such as the cycle on the *lex Iulia*, did not go back to earlier unpublished collections, but were composed directly for publication. So Martial's procedure was different from that of Statius in the *Silvae*, who published only poems that had previously been offered to their addressee, also where that addressee was the emperor. For Martial, publication had much greater autonomy than for Statius, partly, no doubt, because of the large readership that he succeeded in reaching[72].

---

[70] On the first and second editions of Book 1 and their respective opening poems see Citroni 1975: xix–xxi, 5, 13–14, 17–18.

[71] On the letter at the beginning of Book 9 see p. 114.

[72] See pp. 131–141.

The success of Martial's published books made them interesting for the emperor, as a not negligible vehicle for the propagation of his public image. But the emperor, and the themes he offered, must also have been interesting for Martial. At the beginning of the dedicatory letter to Book 8 he writes:

> Omnes ... libelli mei, domine, quibus tu famam, id est vitam, dedisti, tibi supplicant; et, puto, propter hoc legentur. (8.*ep*.3–5)

> All my little books, Lord, to which you have given fame, that is life, are your suppliants; and, I think, it is because of this that they will be read.

Martial claims that his books will find a wide readership because they contain poems addressed to the emperor; he also claims that the emperor has furthered their reputation (which also ascertains a wide readership), perhaps by being known to read and endorse them[73]. Both statements would be unconvincing as flattery if they did not contain a kernel of truth: just as in the modern world a large measure of attention paid to (and by) royalty may boost the circulation of a tabloid newspaper, so in the ancient world courtly poems (and courtly support) may have increased the readership of collections of light poetry. So even though in Book 8 (as earlier in Book 5), Martial had felt compelled to suppress sexually explicit material (another key to popularity in ancient and modern times alike), the inclusion of large amounts of imperial panegyric not only hampered, but also helped him. It seems that the success of his published books not only strengthened the position of the emperor, but also his own. This tension will have to be further explored in the next chapter.

[73] Cf. such poems as 4.27 and 6.64, where Martial mentions the emperor as an appreciative reader in contexts of *inuidia* (4.27) and *fama* (6.64).

CHAPTER NINE

FUNCTIONS OF POETRY FOR THE EMPEROR

At the beginning of Martial's first book, after addresses to the reader and the book, the poet turns to the emperor, to defend the licentious nature of his epigrams (1.4). This apologetic poem is immediately followed by another, consisting of a single distich:

> Do tibi naumachiam, tu das epigrammata nobis:
> uis, puto, cum libro, Marce, natare tuo. (1.5)

> I give you a naumachy, you give me epigrams. I guess, Marcus, that you want to swim together with your book.

Apparently, Domitian is to be imagined as speaking. A naumachy was a staged naval battle, such as we know Domitian to have organised both in the amphitheatre (with miniature vessels) and in a specially constructed basin (with full-scale ships)[1]; here it is the context for a joking threat to throw the poet into the water, together with his book, so as to efface the ink on the papyrus roll[2]. The relationship between emperor and poet is one of personal patronage: there is a lasting, familiar relationship, brought out by the use of the *praenomen* (*Marcus*)[3] and by the bantering tone; there is exchange, formulated with maximum incisiveness ("I give ... you give"); but there is also asymmetry: epigrams are poor things when set against naumachies. Yet there is a complication: naumachies are not given to Martial personally: they are gifts to the City of Rome, and therefore Martial's relationship of personal patronage with the emperor is embedded in community patronage[4].

---

[1] See Suet. *Dom.* 4.1–2, D.C. 67.8.2, and Coleman 1993: 54–55, 58–60.

[2] The motif that a work deserves destruction by water is common (see Citroni 1975: 34). Martial similarly uses it with mock-modest reference to his own work at 3.100 and 9.58.

[3] It is true that *Martialis* would not fit into the elegiac distich, but Martial could have employed another metre (e.g. hendecasyllables), had he wished to; cf. Citroni 1975: 35.

[4] On community patronage see pp. 327–328.

As if to stress this point, the poem immediately following the one just quoted is about games given by Domitian in the amphitheatre (1.6). But that poem also shows that the poets are implicated in an even wider discourse than that of communal gratitude. The theme is an astonishing feat of animal training: lions held hares in their mouths without devouring them. Martial compares these lions with the eagle who carried Ganymede unharmed to Jupiter, and then asks:

> Quae maiora putas miracula? Summus utrisque
> auctor adest: haec sunt Caesaris, illa Iouis. (1.6.5–6)

> Which do you think the greater miracle? Both are due to the highest authority: the one to Caesar, the other to Jupiter.

As someone responsible for "miracles", Domitian is compared to Jupiter, with the suggestion (if we take the question as rhetorical) that his miracles even surpass those of the god. This way of talking about the emperor in terms appropriate to divinity is very common in Martial and Statius, and is usually treated under the heading of the "imperial cult": the two standard references define the subject as "the imperial cult in Martial and Statius" and as part of "the imperial cult under the Flavians"[5]. Although poetry did not form part of the cult, in so far as it did not function in ritual contexts[6], the choice of terminology can be defended, because "imperial cult" is a catch-all phrase, which covers many different phenomena, and because the discourse of poetry certainly contributed, together with the discourses of ritual, architecture, statuary and coinage, to the construction of the image of the emperor as a god[7].

The comparison of the emperor with Jupiter found in poem 1.6 may be used as an example. Such comparisons, as well as more straightforward identifications, occur very frequently in both Martial

[5] Sauter 1934, K. Scott 1936; similarly e.g. Thraede 1973 ("Die Poesie und der Kaiserkult").

[6] Exceptions are hymns for the *ludi saeculares*, and in a sense the poetry declaimed at the Capitoline and Alban Games (cf. pp. 328–335).

[7] The multiformity of the "imperial cult" is stressed by Beard, North and Price 1998: 348; cf. more generally 140–49, 206–10, 348–62. Other books that I have found illuminating on the "imperial cult" (in the broadest sense) include Veyne 1976 (esp. 560–89, 736–42), Hopkins 1978a (197–242), Price 1984, Zanker 1987, Lendon 1997 (esp.160–72), Bergmann 1998, Clauss 1999.

and Statius, who in this respect tread in the footsteps of earlier poets[8]. But the representation of the emperor as a god is also to be found in other media: in art, Domitian was not only depicted as enjoying the special protection of Jupiter, he was also depicted (like other emperors before him) *as* Jupiter, clad in a mantle which left the upper part of the body naked, and carrying a sceptre[9]. In the coinage the identification (or comparison) is adumbrated in various ways; the most conspicuous coin type is one appearing after Domitian's first victories over the Dacians, showing him crowned by Victory and carrying a thunderbolt, the attribute of Jupiter; perhaps this type goes back to a statuary monument[10]. Statius somewhere has the phrase "the swift thunderbolt of the invincible emperor" (*Silv.* 4.7.49–50), and one might regard this as an adequate "translation" into words of the pictorial motif. Elsewhere, however, he speaks of the emperor's thunderbolt as the instrument of banishing the father of Claudius Etruscus (*Silv.* 3.3.158). This time the motif is purely literary, going back to Ovid in his exile, also used by Seneca in his exile, and taken up by Martial in the same context as Statius[11]. So the poets, even if dependent on other discourses, enjoyed a certain freedom in constructing their own discourse, a freedom which had to do with the more flexible and less "official" nature of their medium. This might lead to a certain extravaganza, as we saw in Martial's suggestion in poem 1.6 that Domitian even surpasses Jupiter[12]. Yet a poet will not

---

[8] For Martial and Statius the material is systematically collected in Sauter 1934: 54–78 and K. Scott 1936: 133–40; for other poets cf. e.g. Fears 1981. I do not think there is a significant difference between "identification" and "comparison" (or "metaphor", as used by Bergmann 1998): in any case one has to ask how far the identification goes (because it cannot be complete), and this amounts to the same as asking how far the comparison goes.

[9] Domitian was depicted *in sinu dei* in the temple of Jupiter Custos (Tac. *Hist.* 3.74.1; cf. p. 331). On statues in the guise of Jupiter see Maderna 1988: 19, 26, 160 (JS 4), 170 (JT 9), who also discusses other emperors (18–55, 156–96).

[10] *BMC* 2.372 (n. *), 377 (n. †), 381 (no. 381), 386 (n. ‖), 389 (no. 410), 399 (no. 443), 403 (nos. 465–66), 406 (no. 476). The suggestion that the type goes back to a monument is made by Bergmann 1998: 95–96.

[11] Ov. *Trist.* 1.1.72, 81–82, 1.3.11–12, 2.33–40, 3.5.7, 5.2b.9–10 (53–54), 5.3.31, *Pont.* 1.7.46; Sen. *Cons. Plb.* (*Dial.* 11).13.4; Mart. 6.83.

[12] On the tendency of poetic discourse to go further in its panegyric than other discourses cf. e.g. Fears 1977: 1–17, Bergmann 1998: 219–30.

write in this way unless he gauges, from the reception accorded by the emperor to his earlier efforts or from the imperial representation in other media, that such language is welcome. The imperial cult, like patronage, was a question of negotiation, in which both parties made moves in order to define their relationship[13].

This is especially important because elite opinion at Rome kept a close and suspicious watch on how the emperor conducted these negotiations. Too uninhibited a divinisation was not appreciated, because it was interpreted as a sign of arrogance and loss of perspective, and some emperors were criticised on this count after their death: they include not only Gaius and Nero, but also Domitian. Thus Pliny, in his *Panegyric of Trajan*, written in 100–101, contrasts Trajan's good sense with his predecessor's lack of moderation: Domitian wished to be addressed as "god" (*deus*) and "lord" (*dominus*) (2.3), he seriously believed himself to be a god (11.1, 78.2), and he placed his statues in temples and had himself worshipped by sacrifices (53); nevertheless his self-assumed divinity was of no avail when his punishment came to seek him (49.1). Martial himself, who published three books (10–12) under Domitian's successors, joins in the chorus of critics, revoking his own previous behaviour:

Frustra, Blanditiae, uenitis ad me
attritis miserabiles labellis:
dicturus dominum deumque non sum.
Iam non est locus hac in Vrbe uobis;
ad Parthos procul ite pilleatos
et turpes humilesque supplicesque
pictorum sola basiate regum.
Non est hic dominus sed imperator,
sed iustissimus omnium senator,
per quem de Stygia domo reducta est
siccis rustica Veritas capillis.
Hoc sub principe, si sapis, caueto,
uerbis, Roma, prioribus loquaris.

In vain you come to me, Flatteries, poor things with worn-out lips: I am not going to say "lord and god". No longer is there place for you in this City; (5) go far away to the turbaned Parthians, and, foul, mean, and begging, kiss the soles of gaudy kings. There is no lord here, but a commander-in-chief, but the most just of all senators, (10) who has

[13] Cf. Price 1984: 65–77.

brought back from the house of Styx rustic Truth with unperfumed hair. Under this emperor, if you are wise, beware, Rome, of using your former words.

Like Pliny, Martial contrasts Domitian with Trajan[14], and stresses that Domitian had been commonly addressed as *dominus et deus* ("lord and god"). And indeed Martial had used this mode of address a number of times in his epigrams[15]. Even if the allegation of some late sources that Domitian *required* the formula may be a hostile distortion, there can be no doubt that he *allowed* it[16]. Moreover, the line between allowing and requiring is a thin one: if the emperor reacted positively to a certain form of address, it might be difficult in practice to refrain from using it. Significantly, both Pliny and Martial, while attacking Domitian, nevertheless attribute the behaviour they regret to "us" (Plin. *Pan.* 2.3) or to "Rome" (Mart. 10.72.13).

The dynamics of flattery will require special attention later on in this chapter, but some introductory remarks may be made here. Any interpretation of the functions of Martial's and Statius' imperial poems will have to take account of the very unequal distribution of themes both between and within these authors. Out of the six themes of Statius' imperial *Silvae*, five do not register in Martial: the equestrian statue of Domitian (1.1), a celebration of the Kalends of December in the amphitheatre (1.6), the death of a lion in the amphitheatre (2.5), Domitian's seventeenth consulship (4.1), and the new road constructed in Campania (4.3); only the theme of a meal at the palace (4.2) finds parallels in Martial, although it is not certain

---

[14] Conceivably, the poem could refer to Nerva (as is assumed e.g. by Sullivan 1991: 77), but *imperator* (8) does not very well suit an unwarlike emperor, and the parallels with the *Panegyricus* rather suggest Trajan: cf. e.g. (among many similar passages) 1.6 and 54.4 on the replacement of flattery by *ueritas*, and 63.6 on the contrast between *principes* who want to be *domini* and those who are content to be *senatores*.

[15] Mart. 5.8.1, 7.34.8, 8.2.6, 9.66.3; cf. 8.82.2–3, 9.28.7–8.

[16] That Domitian required the appellation is stated by Aur. Vict. 11.2, *Epit. Caes.* 11.6, Eutr. 7.23, Oros. 7.10.2, Eus.-Hier. p. 190 H.^{2}, but is not implied by either Suet. *Dom.* 13.2 or D.C. 67.4.7, and is probably untrue (Thompson 1984, B.W. Jones 1992: 108–09, 1996: 109–10). But the appellation was regularly used not only by Martial, but by many others as well (D.C. 67.13.4: παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων; D.Chr. 45.1 [a contemporary testimony]: παρὰ πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις); cf. K. Scott 1936: 102–12, Murison 1999: 228–29.

whether both poets refer to the same occasion[17]. Within the collections, the imperial poems are very unevenly scattered over the books. In Statius, three poems (1.1, 1.6, 2.5) are from 93 at the latest, but quite probably from a few years earlier, whereas the three other poems are all from the short period between the winter of 94/95 and the summer of 95. In Martial, the amount of imperial poems increases sharply with Book 8 at the end of 93 (or the beginning of 94) from ca. 10% to ca. 25%[18].

The quantitative rise in panegyric is accompanied by a qualitative intensification (e.g. of the use of divine vocabulary), and this might give rise to the idea Martial responded to the increased rigour of Domitian's tyranny that is often supposed to have started with the condemnation of Herennius Senecio, the younger Helvidius Priscus, and their circle at the end of 93[19]. But caution is enjoined by the comparison with Statius, where a comparable quantitative and qualitative increase in panegyric occurs significantly later. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the events of 93 really constituted a turning point. The idea derives from Tacitus and Pliny, who both had an axe to grind: Tacitus consoled his father-in-law Agricola, who had died in August 93, that he had been spared the worst, whereas Pliny, who had been praetor in 93 (or perhaps earlier), declared that his career came to a standstill after that date, when the situation considerably worsened; moreover, he was proud of his friendship with this circle and composed an oration *de Heluidi ultione*[20]. Suetonius, on

---

[17] Mart. 8.39 and 8.49 (50) are from 93, whereas *Silv.* 4.2 is from the winter of 94/95. It is possible, however, that Mart. 9.91 (from 94) refers to the same meal as Statius' poem (Henriksén 1998–99: 2.134–35 is too sceptical).

[18] See for statistics e.g. A. Martin 1986, Coleman 1998a: 339, and Henriksén 1998–99: 1.22 (with a histogram).

[19] For these condemnations see D.C. 67.13.2; Suet. *Dom.* 10.3–4; Tac. *Agr.* 2.1, 45.1; Plin. *Ep.* 3.11.2–3.

[20] Tac. *Agr.* 44.1 (date of death), 44.5–45.2 (consolation). Pliny's statement on his career (*Pan.* 95.3–4) has generally been doubted, because of his subsequent tenure, supposedly in 94–96, of the post of *praefectus* of the *aerarium militare* (cf. e.g. Syme 1958: 77 and 1991c: 564–65, Giovannini 1987: 232–40). But a date under Nerva has recently been argued by Birley 2000: 14–16 (who also, following Harte 1935, dates the praetorship to 89 or 90 rather than 93: 10–14). On Pliny's links to the circle of Herennius Senecio cf. i.a. *Ep.* 1.5.1–4, 1.14.1–2, 3.11.3, 7.19.10, and

the other hand, sees a deterioration already in 89 (*Dom.* 10.5), after the suppression of the revolt of Saturninus, and Tacitus' and Pliny's perceptions need not have been universally shared.

More fundamentally, it may be argued that Martial did not need to be coerced or bullied or frightened into more extravagant celebration of the emperor, but that he was pursuing his own advantage. To be seen to honour the emperor conferred honour, especially so if this could be perceived as being done on the encouragement of the emperor himself, so that the permission to honour him was in itself a sign of honour[21]. Martial may have derived prestige, and even, as he claimed (8.*ep*.3–5), success with the reading public, from the amount of courtly matter that he could afford to include. Books 8 and 9 may be seen as a final stage in a process of increasingly successful negotiation, in which Martial gradually strengthened his position, even if he also had to make concessions and incurred obligations he could not well neglect.

Martial's first published books under Domitian are the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, containing descriptions of Saturnalian presents; slight as these books are, they do not presume to reckon with the emperor as a reader, but nevertheless do pay him compliments when a suitable association offers[22]. In Book 1 Martial anticipates that he emperor may be among his readers, and imagines the dialogue that has been discussed above (1.4–5), but the book contains no further imperial poems apart from the lions-hares-cycle, which had probably been sent to the emperor earlier[23]. In Book 2 the emperor is honoured at the beginning (2) and end (91–92), whereas in Book 3 he is absent, doubtless because Martial himself was absent from Rome, so that there was no opportunity for interaction. Book 4 then contains a number of imperial poems, at the beginning of the book and elsewhere, and this seems to have been appreciated, because in Book 5 Martial takes the further step of dedicating the book to the emperor.

9.13 (*de Heluidi ultione*). The question of the significance of the year 93 is given nuanced discussion in Syme 1983a = *RP* 4.252–77 (cf. also Syme 1991c: 575–77).

[21] Cf. Lendon 1997: 165–67 on honouring the emperor and e.g. 48, 56–58, 131–36 on being honoured by him.

[22] Mart. 13.4 (first poem), 74, 91, 109, 127 (last poem); 14.34, 53, 73, 124, 170, 179 (cf. 14.1).

[23] See p. 368.

It may be surmised that for such a dedication permission had to be sought, and that either or both of the courtiers honoured at the beginning of the book, Sextus (5.5) and Parthenius (5.6), may have been instrumental in obtaining it; the absence of obscenity in this book will have been part of the agreement[24]. In the following books, 6 and 7, which were not dedicated to the emperor, obscenity could be reintroduced, but the level of engagement with imperial themes had to be kept up. In these books Martial becomes ever more confident of his own success with his reading public, and thus of the usefulness to Domitian of what he has to offer[25], and this may have prompted his decision to repeat the move of Book 5 at a higher level: again a dedication (perhaps again mediated by Parthenius, who recurs in this book: 8.28), combined with a suspension of obscenity which is not sustained in the following books, and an intensification of panegyric which is[26]. Martial himself gives as his reason that Book 8 "enjoys more frequently the opportunity of showing piety [i.e. towards the emperor]" (8.*ep*.5–6), meaning the celebrations of the victory over the Sarmatians that figure largely in the sequel; yet in Books 5 and 6 the similar celebrations connected with the double triumph over the Germans and Dacians are barely mentioned[27]. The difference is conspicuous, and may well be explained from Martial's greater self-confidence rather than from pressure put upon him[28]. Quite similarly, the spate of imperial poems in Statius' fourth book of *Silvae* may have been triggered by the invitation celebrated in 4.2, which showed Statius that he still enjoyed the favour of the court (cf. 4.2.63–68).

---

[24] On Sextus and Parthenius as "brokers" see pp. 343–346.

[25] This perspective is rightly stressed by Citroni 1988: 17–27 = 1996: 28–45, who offers a more detailed survey of Martial's negotiations with Domitian than I can attempt here.

[26] "The following books" are 9 and the first edition of 10 (which Martial later withdrew; cf. 10.2), but not the second edition of 10, 11, and 12, which were written under Nerva and Trajan.

[27] There is a passing reference to this triumph at 6.10.8, and it is included in the plural *triumphos* at 5.19.3 and 6.4.2; cf. Citroni 1989: 220–22 (both Howell 1995: 97 and Grewing 1997: 96 are imprecise).

[28] An alternative explanation, that Martial was including additional propaganda to counter a feeling of crisis, is discussed and rightly rejected by Coleman 1998a: 345–50, 354.

So, neither in Martial nor in Statius do we find anything resembling complete or systematic coverage, anything that could be interpreted as implementing a programme of propaganda or 'public relations' devised by the regime[29]. Rather the poets write from within an individual relationship with the emperor, and are engaged in an ongoing process of negotiation and exchange, of honouring and being honoured.

Interpreting Evergetism

The most frequent theme in Martial's and Statius' poems for the emperor is what historians call his *evergetism*, i.e. the giving of "bread and circuses" (and of temples and other edifices) to the populace, although they pay less attention to the yearly round of routine imperial benefactions than to special events and extraordinary constructions[30]. Four out of the six poems Statius addresses to Domitian fall in this category (1.6, 2.5, 4.2, 4.3)[31], and the proportion in Martial is similar; e.g., in his long series on Domitian's victory over the Sarmatians in Book 8, the military deeds themselves receive no attention, but all poems are devoted to the joy of the people of Rome and to the generosity extended to them by the emperor in giving games and distributing food and money[32]. The explanation lies in the importance of evergetism in constructing the relationship be-

---

[29] From a different angle, this has been argued in ch.7, in the section on "initiative" (pp. 349–355).

[30] The phrase "bread and circuses" is a translation of Juv. 10.81: *panem et circenses* (cf. Fro. *Princ. Hist.* 20 [213.12 v.d.H.^{2}]: *annona et spectaculeis*), and is often used as a convenient shorthand for evergetism (e.g. in the title of Veyne 1976). But in Martial and Statius, the circus hardly occurs in an imperial context (only Mart. *Sp.* 34 [30 {28}], 7.7, 8.11, 8.78): the focus is on unusual spectacles in the amphitheatre. For the poets' selectivity in dealing with Domitian's building programme cf. Scheithauer 2000: 136–53, esp. 146.

[31] One might add 1.1: although the statue described in that poem was a gift (*munus*) from Senate and people to the emperor (99–100), not the other way round, it was still a notable contribution, owed to the emperor, towards the magnificence (if one chose to see it that way) of the City of Rome.

[32] Joy: 8.2, 4, 8, 11, 15, 21 (in 2 and 8 attributed to the god Janus); games: 26, 30, 53 (55), 78, 80; dinners and distributions: 36, 39, 49 (50), 56 (54). See further p. 372.

tween emperor and subjects: the emperor deployed his superior resources to please his subjects, and the subjects honoured and exalted their emperor. The relationship thus constructed was characterised by asymmetry, duration, and reciprocity, and can therefore be described as "community patronage"[33]. The poetry of Martial and Statius was written within the context of "personal patronage", and they naturally connected the relationship between the emperor and themselves with the relationship between the emperor and the community of which they were a part.

This integration of the "communal" with the "personal" manifests itself perhaps most obviously in those poems which do not focus on Rome. The emperor's evergetism was directed at "his" City only, whereas the other cities in the empire received their games and their buildings from the local elite, and had quite another relationship to the emperor than had Rome. Statius and Martial wrote—as court poets must—from the perspective of the Capital[34], and praised the great gifts of Domitian to Senate and people. But there are a few exceptions, and these are to be explained from the personal circumstances of the poets. Thus Martial wrote on Domitian's fish-pond at Baiae (4.30), in a book which contains other testimony of his stay at that resort (4.57, 63; cf. 44). But the major exception is Statius' poem on the *uia Domitiana*, the road Domitian built between Sinuessa and Puteoli by way of Cumae (*Silvae* 4.3). Of course this road served Roman interests, by providing better connections with the Campanian *uilla* landscape (cf. 112–13) and with the port of Puteoli, but it also served the interests of Campania (which was still suffering from the effects of the eruption of Vesuvius in 79); moreover, the road continued the tradition of the tunnels, canals and harbours with which previous emperors had impressed the inhabitants of Campania (cf. 7–8)[35]. The reason Statius wrote about the project is that he him-

---

[33] See pp. 327–328.

[34] Martial sent Book 3 from Gallia Cisalpina (3.1, 4), and significantly enough, this is the only Domitianic book without "imperial" poems. On Book 12, published under Trajan from Spain, see below, pp. 438–440.

[35] On Roman *villeggiatura* in Campania cf. D'Arms 1970, on the economic importance of Puteoli D'Arms 1974 and 1981 and Frederiksen 1984: 319–49 (336 on imperial engineering projects); on Domitian's intentions cf. also McKay 1998.

self was a Campanian, from Naples, and had personally experienced the advantages of the new construction[36].

The impressiveness of the engineering achievement (which was indeed considerable[37]) is brought out by a long technical description (40–55), rounded off by historical comparisons (56–60) and geographical amplification (61–66), but the main weight of the poem falls on two *prosopopoeiae* addressed to Domitian, the first by the river Volturnus, newly canalised and bridged (72–94), the second, which concludes the poem, by the Sibyl of Cumae (124–63). The theme of the river's speech is the domination of nature by human effort, a theme familiar from Statius' poems to Pollius Felix, *Silvae* 2.2 and 3.1, which also have a Campanian setting[38]. In *Silvae* 4.3, however, the language has a stronger political ring: the river has been bound by "laws" (75), and is gladly subservient to its leader (*dux*):

> Sed grates ago seruitusque tanti est
> quod sub te duce, te iubente, cessi,
> quod tu maximus arbiter meaeque
> uictor perpetuus legere ripae. (81–84)

> But I pay thanks and my servitude is worth it, because under you as leader, under your command I have yielded, because you will be read of as the great overseer and eternal conqueror of my bank.

Statius' expression "you will be read of" (*legere*) primarily refers to an inscription on the bridge commemorating Domitian's achievement, but it may also hint at his own poem, which gives further articulation to messages already encoded in the road itself. This at two points was spanned by arches, of which one, the Arco Felice near Cumae, is still standing; another, now lost, marked the beginning of the road at Sinuessa, and is described by Statius as "gleaming with the trophies of our warlike leader" (98–99)[39]. So the motif of victory

---

[36] See further p. 360.

[37] Cf. Frederiksen 1984: 18.

[38] Cf. p. 319.

[39] Kleiner 1991 argues that the arch was at the bridge, as lines 95–100 do indeed seem to suggest, but lines 100–101 make the location clear. Nevertheless Kleiner is right to insist that the arch represents the victory over nature more than victory over foreign enemies. There may have been a third arch at Puteoli: see Coleman 1988: 128.

was already present in the architecture of the road, and taken up and extended in the poem.

In the second of the speeches, the Cumaean Sibyl picks up these ideas, not without reminiscences of her two famous appearances in Virgil: she echoes both her own prophecy of a new Golden Age in the fourth eclogue and Anchises' prophecy in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, delivered to Aeneas when he was visiting the underworld under her guidance (as she recalls at 130–33). But she makes some significant modifications[40]. Thus, whereas in the fourth eclogue the expression "the great succession of the ages" (*magnus saeclorum ordo*: 5) is linked to a renewal of world history in general, Statius' Sibyl uses the phrase to characterise the longevity granted the emperor by the Parcae (145–52). This shift is prepared for in earlier panegyric, where the Parcae's weaving of a new Golden Age has turned into the weaving of golden life-threads of eternal (or near-eternal) length for the ruler[41]. By an easy transition the return of the Golden Age is attributed to the present ruler (rather than projected in a miraculous future, as in the fourth eclogue), and then the connection with the sixth book of the *Aeneid* is easily made, where it is Augustus who is responsible for re-establishing the Golden Age in Latium (791–794)[42]. In Anchises' prophecy, this is immediately followed by a prediction that Augustus will extend his realm into the regions of the Atlas and the Nile, beyond the ecliptic and the zodiac, where only Bacchus and Hercules have gone before (794–805). Statius' Sibyl closely paraphrases what she has once heard Anchises say[43]:

---

[40] On Statius' use of Virgil cf. van Dam 1992: 202–09, Stärk 1995: 83–86

[41] See Sen. *Apoc.* 4.1 (which, like Statius' poem [150–51], has the comparison with Nestor and Tithonus [14]) and Calp. *Ecl.* 4.139–40 (cf. p. 83, n. 161 on the date); in Mart. 6.3 the golden threads are those of a hoped-for son of the emperor.

[42] Cf. Calp. *Ecl.* 4.76–77 (~ fourth eclogue), 5–8, 82–146 (celebration of the *aurea saecula* under the present ruler), and 1.42–45 (~ fourth eclogue), 64 (~*A.* 6.791–94); for more material cf. Gatz 1967: 135–43. This explanation from the panegyrical tradition seems preferable to van Dam's suggestion (1992: 206) that Statius believed the *puer* of *Ecl.* 4 to be Augustus: the idea, attested in a few late scholia, is unlikely to go back to the first century.

[43] Anchises' prophecy is itself inspired by Sibylline oracles, as was shown by Norden 1899: 476–82 = 1966: 430–36. The astronomy of Virgil and Statius was explained by Housman 1906: 44–45 = 1972: 2.650–52.

> Iurauit tibi iam niualis Arctus,
> nunc magnos Oriens dabit triumphos.
> Ibis qua uagus Hercules et Euhan
> ultra sidera flammeumque solem
> et Nili caput et niues Atlantis (153–57)

> Already the snowy North has sworn you allegiance; now the Orient will give you mighty triumphs. (155) You will go where roaming Hercules and Bacchus went, beyond the stars and the flaming sun, and even[44] the Nile's source and the snows of Atlas

After this, the Sibyl explicitly re-introduces the motif of the triumph:

> et laudum cumulo beatus omni
> scandes belliger abnuesque currus,
> donec Troicus ignis et renatae
> Tarpeius pater intonabit aulae,
> haec donec uia te regente terras
> annosa magis Appia senescat. (158–63)

> and blessed with all increment of praises, you will mount, warlike, some triumphal chariots and decline others, (160) as long as the Trojan fire will burn and the Tarpeian father thunder in his resurrected palace, until this road, as you rule the lands, will become even older than the ancient Appian Way.

Thus, the domination of a piece of rough terrain by road-constructors is made into an image of Domitian's triumphs, of his legitimation by Jupiter (whose temple he restored[45]), and of his consummation of the Trojan tradition of Aeneas (who brought the Trojan fire to Rome) and Augustus.

The road celebrated in *Silvae* 4.3 is an example of evergetism only in so far as it is a contribution to the well-being of the inhabitants of the empire; it is not a gift to the City of Rome. The situation is different with *Silvae* 4.2, 1.6 and 2.5, which are about "bread and circuses" in the narrow sense. I begin with *Silvae* 4.2, because that poem shows the closest intertwining of the personal and the communal.

---

[44] Van Dam 1992: 209 (after Brandes) changes the first *et* in 157 to *ad*, but this would be too specific.

[45] See p. 332 with n. 18.

In *Silvae* 4.2, Statius describes a splendid feast given by Domitian in his magnificent new palace on the Palatine[46]: Statius has himself been among the (invited) guests, and writes his poem as a thanksgiving. There are strong similarities to the poems on villas, which were also written on the occasion of a visit. Thus, the poem is based on the poet's own visual memories, and is structured by the movements of his rapt gaze[47]. After noting the huge amount of columns (18–20) and the sheer size of the banqueting hall (20–26), Statius details the various kinds of coloured marbles used in the superimposed orders of columns (27–30), and then continues upwards: "far above stretches the sight: with straining eyes one could scarcely take in the roof, and one would believe it to be the ceiling of gilded heaven" (30–31)[48]. Also, the description of the building is closely tied to the characterisation of the owner, but differently from what is the case in the villa poems, here the owner is himself another object of visual wonder: "is it you I behold?" (15–16), "himself, himself alone I had leisure to watch with eager eyes" (40). Domitian as host far surpasses an ordinary Roman aristocrat; in effect, the entire poem is predicated upon the association of the banqueting hall with a temple (20–26) and even with heaven itself[49]:

> mediis uideor discumbere in astris
> cum Ioue et Iliaca porrectum sumere dextra
> immortale merum. (10–12)

---

[46] Useful surveys of Domitian's palace are MacDonald 1982: 47–74, Darwall-Smith 1996: 179–215, and Claridge 1998: 134–41. I had not yet access to Royo 1999.

[47] The most striking parallel among the villa poems is *Silv.* 1.3, where we find such exclamations as *quam lassos per tot miracula uisus!* (14), *Huc oculis huc mente trahor* (33), *Dum uagor aspectu uisusque per omnia duco* (52). On *Silv.* 2.2 cf. van Dam 1984: 221.

[48] Because Statius' enthusiasm about the number of columns, it has often been thought (e.g. by MacDonald 1982: 61–62) that he refers to the so-called *aula regia*, but the triclinium had a tiered columnar decoration, which will certainly have produced the required impression: see Gibson, DeLaine and Claridge 1994: 81, who at 91 (fig. 29) provide an instructive reconstruction drawing (reproduced in Claridge 1998: 137 (fig. 57).

[49] On the language of religion in the poem cf. Cancik 1965: 65–87 and Vessey 1983.

I feel as if I am reclining in the midst of the stars together with Jupiter and to partake of immortal wine proffered by the hand of Ganymede.

As in 4.3, here too, Statius verbally articulates a message which was already encoded in the architecture. The façade of the palace was probably three-storied, with the top-story reproducing the design of a temple; inside, the use of apses in the staterooms also created a numinous atmosphere[50]. Moreover, the high ceiling (and presumably its gold ornamentation) suggested heaven, not only to Statius (18–20, 30–31 [quoted above]), but also to Martial (7.56, 8.36, 9.91). These texts have led to the hypothesis that he hall was barrel-vaulted or even domed, but archaeological considerations tell against this[51]; nevertheless, even a flat timber ceiling, very high up and appropriately decorated, may well have been intended to carry celestial connotations[52]. In any case it seems that in later times the room was known as the *Iouis cenatio*, the "dining-hall of Jupiter" (SHA *Pert.* 11.6).

Both Statius and Martial use the implications of the setting to develop panegyrical *pointes*. In Book Eight Martial includes two closely connected epigrams, one focusing on the building, the other on the meal. The first ends with a paradox on the near-divine character of the palace's chief inhabitant:

Haec, Auguste, tamen, quae uertice sidera pulsat,
par domus est caelo, sed minor est domino. (8.36.11–12)

---

[50] The reconstruction of the façade depends on whether it is depicted on *BMC* 2.406 (n. *), as I assume, with e.g. MacDonald 1982: 55–56 (cf. 73) and Darwall-Smith 1996: 190–93; others believe that the coin rather represents the *Templum Gentis Flauiae*; cf. Davies 2000: 27, 151. On the use of apses (present in the so-called *basilica* and *aula regia*, as well as in the triclinium) cf. Tamm 1963: 147–88, 215–16.

[51] Barrel-vaulted: most forcefully MacDonald 1982: 56–63 (but note the agnosticism at 187, added in the second edition); domed: implicitly Cancik 1965: 75–76, explicitly Coleman 1988: 89–90; against: Gibson, DeLaine and Claridge 1994: 77–80, Darwall-Smith 1996: 193–99. The *Templum Gentis Flauiae* is often called a "heaven" by the poets (Mart. 9.3.12, 9.34.2, perhaps 10.51.14; Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.19, 5.1.241), because it was the abode of the deified members of the Flavian dynasty; it need not have been domed (or round) (cf. Darwall-Smith 1996: 162, Davies 2000: 27).

[52] The gold used in the decoration of the ceiling (31; cf. 3.3.103) probably represented stars; cf. Coleman 1988: 93, 109.

> However, this house, Emperor, which with its summit hits the stars, is equal to heaven, yet smaller than its master.

The motif is taken op by Statius, who writes that the palace is "smaller only than its master" (*tantum domino minor*: 25). Martial's second epigram similarly ends with a wittily formulated variation upon a traditional panegyrical motif:

> Esse uelis oro serus conuiua Tonantis:
> at tu si properas, Iuppiter, ipse ueni. (8.39.5–6)

> Please be late, I pray, in becoming a dinner guest of the Thunderer. But if you are in a hurry, Jupiter, come yourself.

If a good emperor died, he could count on divinisation: hence the conventional wish that he may wait long before definitely seeking the companionship of the gods[53]. But if, in a sense, he already is in heaven, the gods could just as well come to him. Statius gives a slightly different turn to the motif: when describing the palace as a temple and as a kind of heaven, he exclaims in a parenthesis "and don't hurry to mount great heaven", prompted by the thought that from the Palatine to heaven, *ce n'est qu'un pas*[54].

Yet, during the meal praised in *Silvae* 4.2, Domitian's pretences to the divine were counterbalanced by a show of common humanity. Statius shows himself overwhelmed not only by the emperor's imposing presence, but also by his egalitarian attitude:

> Tene ego ...
> cerno iacens? Datur haec iuxta, datur ora tueri
> uina inter mensasque, et non assurgere fas est? (14–17)

> Is it you I ... behold while I may lay down? Is it granted, is it really granted to look upon this face from close by, amid drinking and feasting, and is it no sin not to rise up?

This seems to refer to a late entrance of the emperor, at which the guests, already present, made ready to rise, but were then bidden to

---

[53] On the theme of *serus in caelum redeas* (Hor. *C.* 1.2.45) see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 37.

[54] With Coleman (cf. 1988: 190) and Courtney, but against van Dam 1992: 198–200 (who denies the relevance of the *serus in caelum redeas* motif here), I accept Gronovius' emendation *escendere* (*excedere* M).

remain reclined[55]. Domitian thus displayed the "civility" that was expected of an emperor; moreover, he conformed to the ideology of the common meal, which was supposed to be a *locus* for the celebration of a shared humanity, untrammelled by social distinctions[56]. However, the hierarchical reality usually intervened, and it certainly intervened here, as Statius' use of religious vocabulary immediately reveals. The entire staging of the meal in the enormous triclinium was designed to emphasise, rather than neutralise, the emperor's power: in order to have been visible from all of the "thousand tables" (33)—including the one at which Statius reclined—, he must have presided on some kind of elevation, presumably in the apse, which is likely to have been included in the design of the room precisely for this purpose[57].

After his death, Domitian was severely criticised for his lack of civility in the conduct of his repasts. In Pliny's *Panegyricus* he is contrasted with Trajan in this respect as in others:

> For you [scil. Trajan] do not, bloated by a solitary meal before noon, sit menacingly over your dinner guests, watching and observing them, nor do you, belching from a full stomach when theirs is empty and fasting, offer or rather throw at them the food you disdain to touch, nor do you, having grudgingly endured that arrogant mimicking of commensality, return to clandestine gluttony and secret excesses. (49.6)

In a more non-committal tone Suetonius states that Domitian made lunch his primary meal, having little for dinner and skipping the *comissatio*, the drinking which followed the meal proper (*Dom.* 21). This, combined with his irritable and suspicious manner, meant a breach of the code of the *conuiuium*, and of civility generally. Such behaviour is one of the traditional marks of the tyrant, and Pliny

---

55 Cf. Augustus' behaviour described at Suet. *Aug.* 74. Alternatively, Statius merely re-interprets the normal reclining position of the dinner guest as a special allowance not to rise in front of the emperor, which outside the context of a dinner would have been required (cf. Sittl 1890: 152–53, Alföldi 1980: 42–45). If this is so, then there was no "egalitarian attitude" of Domitian. The discussion would be more complicated if Courtney were right in accepting Markland's emendation *non surgere* at line 6, but there *consurgere* should be kept: it refers to rising after the meal is over (cf. *OLD* s.v. *consurgo* 1b), and so is not connected with the point of lines 15–17.

56 On the "civility" of Roman emperors see Wallace-Hadrill 1982; on the ideology (and practice) of the common meal cf. p. 173.

57 Cf. D'Arms 1984: 341–44 (repeated in D'Arms 1990: 309–10).

uninhibitedly uses all the associated motifs: according to the *Panegyricus*, Domitian did not only withdraw from normal human intercourse (as he indeed did), but also abandoned himself to solitary excesses (as he probably did not): moderation cannot be expected of someone who perverts the rites of communality by celebrating them alone[58].

In contrast to Pliny, Statius stresses the emperor's modesty (42–44) and the generous provision of food and drink (33–37). Yet a convivial atmosphere can hardly assert itself in a poem written to thank the emperor because the poet had been "honoured with his most sacred repasts" (4. ep. 6–7). In particular there is no hint of what was a central aspect of the ideology of conviviality, duly stressed by Pliny in his praise of the meals of Trajan: the free flow of talk (49.5) and "decent jesting" (49.8). In Statius communication with the emperor is absent: his is not a poem about speaking, but about watching, even if in comparison with Pliny the direction of the gaze is reversed[59].

The tension between civility and hierarchy is to be found to an even greater degree in *Silvae* 1.6, where Statius describes a public banquet within the framework of a gladiatorial spectacle organised by Domitian on the first of December (*Kalendae Decembres*). Here the norms governing convivial behaviour were reinforced by those governing the behaviour at games: at games the emperor was closely watched by large numbers of his subjects, who expected him to steer the right middle course between friendliness and dignity[60]. The happening described by Statius took place in the Colosseum (the Amphitheatrum Flavium), and comprised not only a meal, but also the distribution of sweetmeats and other gifts, gladiatorial shows, including performances of women and dwarfs, and festive illumination

---

58 Domitian's preference for solitude is often stressed in the sources: e.g. Suet. *Dom.* 3.1, 21, D.C. 66.9.4–5, Tac. *Agr.* 39.3, Plin. *Pan.* 48.3–49.2. On the "solitary feast" as characteristic of the tyrant see Braund 1996b.

59 For Roman meals as spectacles, and for the increased unease of participants when the host turns them from *spectatores* into *spectacula* (as Domitian did according to Pliny), see D'Arms 1999, esp. 313–14.

60 I use the word "games" in a loose sense: not as synonymous with *ludi*, but including *munera* (which apart from gladiatorial presentations could include beast-hunts and executions). For the expected behaviour of the emperor see e.g. Cameron 1976: 157–92 (175–77 on *ciuilitas*), Millar 1992: 370–72, Wiedemann 1992: 165–76, Edmondson 1996: 103–04.

at night[61]. This time Statius could not write as a personal guest of the emperor, and consequently he does not foreground his own individual emotions as he does in *Silvae* 4.2. Another difference is that *Silvae* 4.2 functioned in the wider context of the inauguration of the new imperial palace, whereas the *Amphitheatrum Flavium* had been inaugurated a decade ago under Domitian's predecessor Titus; consequently Statius does not pay special attention to the architectural setting. The upshot of these two differences is that the contents of *Silvae* 1.6 consist in a fairly systematic treatment of the programme of the day, following chronological order. This form may have been suggested by that of official reports (if these existed), but the literary elaboration was certainly Statius' own[62].

Statius begins his poem by rejecting his usual sources of inspiration and invoking others, more specifically connected with the occasion[63]:

> Et Phoebus pater et seuera Pallas
> et Musae procul ite feriatae:
> Iani uos reuocabimus kalendis.
> Saturnus mihi compede exsoluta
> et multo grauidus mero December
> et ridens Iocus et Sales proterui
> adsint, dum refero diem beatum
> laeti Caesaris ebriamque †parcent†. (1–8)

> Father Apollo and stern Minerva and you, Muses, go far hence to make holiday: I shall call you back on January 1st. Saturnus, his fetters loosened, and December, heavy with much wine, and laughing Fun and

[61] It is possible, though not certain, that the event was connected with the celebrations surrounding Domitian's double triumph over the Chatti and the Dacians in 89 (cf. Ville 1981: 150–54). Mart. 5.49, D.C. 67.4.4 and 8.4 may refer to the same occasion; Mart. 8.49 (50) (not necessarily in the amphitheatre) is later. On Suet. *Dom.* 13.1 see below.

[62] On such reports at Alexandria (adduced by Frère 1961: 1.46, n. 2*) see Montevecchi 1981 (esp. 164–66). For Rome, one may think of the *acta diurna*, which seem to have contained details about spectacles (Tac. *Ann.* 13.31.1).

[63] This motif is somewhat of a mannerism with Statius: see also *Silv.* 1.4.19–30, 1.5.1–8, 2.3.6–7, and Vollmer 1898: 285–86.

naughty Jokes, may these inspire me, as I report the happy day of joyous Caesar and the drunken night[64].

By invoking Saturnus with "his fetters loosened" (4), Statius makes it clear that he regards the *Kalendae Decembres* as an anticipation of the Saturnalia, celebrated about two weeks later: that festival was initiated by a ritual removal of woollen "fetters" from a statue of Saturnus, its presiding deity[65]. This is confirmed by the invocation of "December, heavy with much wine" (5): the Saturnalia were regularly regarded as lasting, in a loose sense, during the entire month, doubtless because there were many other festivals in December (notably *munera*, consisting of beast-hunts and gladiators)[66]. This atmosphere was indeed characterised by widespread inebriation, as well as by merriment and joking, which make the invocation of "Fun" and "Jokes" (6) entirely appropriate[67]. The cheerful tone is also conveyed by the metre, the phalaecean hendecasyllable, a shorter and lighter verse than Statius' customary hexameter, which he also was to use a few years later in his other Saturnalian poem (*Silvae* 4.9).

Statius' Saturnalian interpretation of the festival is not his own idea, because he reports that the crowd acclaimed "the Saturnalia of the emperor" (*Saturnalia principis*: 82)[68]. In doing so, they reacted to the humorous and "licensed" character of the proceedings, such as the fights of dwarfs and women (51–64) and the appearance of pros-

---

[64] I translate R. Thomson's *noctem*, not mentioned in Courtney's apparatus, but defended by Markland 1827: 209–10. Cf. Watt 1988: 161, who for palaeographical reasons suggests *cenam*.

[65] See Macr. *Sat*. 1.8.5, Arnob. 4.24.

[66] For the Saturnalia lasting during the whole of December cf. Seneca's satirical hit at Claudius: *Saturno ..., cuius mensem toto anno celebrauit Saturnalicius princeps* (*Apoc*. 8.2), which he later generalised: *olim mensem Decembrem fuisse, nunc annum* (*Ep*. 18.1). Martial frequently refers to the Saturnalia by the simple *December* (2.85.3, 4.14.7, etc.; but note 7.28.7 *medius ... December*). Juvenal regards it as a singular sacrifice *uinum toto nescire Decembri* (7.97). In the fourth century Ausonius associates the gladiatorial fights of December with Saturn: *Ecl*. 16.34–36 (Green).

[67] On drunkenness at the Saturnalia see p. 169 with n. 77; on joking p. 167.

[68] Vollmer 1898: 310 assumes that *Saturnalia principis* is what the crowd shouted, but it may have been just *io Saturnalia*, the regular cry (Mart. 11.2.5; cf. Petr. 58.2).

titutes and other less reputable entertainers (65–74), but especially to the abundant gifts showered upon them (75–80, earlier 9–27). Such gifts, called *missilia*, were a common feature of spectacles, and could consist in all kind of objects; quite often, tokens were distributed, which could later be exchanged for the real gifts[69]. But Statius' enumeration of the "titbits" (10) which dropped on the spectators reads like a list of typical Saturnalian presents. It begins with nuts (12), which were used as stakes in gambling (exceptionally allowed at the Saturnalia) and were considered highly characteristic of the festival, and continues with dates, damsons, figs, pastries (in human shape and otherwise), apples (or pears), and a further kind of dates (13–20); all these can be paralleled from the Saturnalian poetry of Martial[70]. At a later stage in the proceedings fowl were distributed: flamingos, pheasants, and guinea-fowl (75–80); these, too, occur among Martial's Saturnalian presents[71].

The gift-giving reinforced the atmosphere of abundance which was already generated by the distributions of food and wine. This abundance is compared by Statius to the Golden Age under Saturn, of which the temporary return was celebrated at the Saturnalia:

> I nunc saecula compara, Vetustas,
> antiqui Iouis aureumque tempus:
> non sic libera uina tunc fluebant
> nec tardum seges occupabat annum. (39–42)

> Come on, Antiquity, compare the ages of ancient Jove [i.e. Saturnus][72] and the golden time: not so freely did wine flow then, nor did the harvest anticipate the sluggish year.

---

[69] See e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 74.6–7, J. *AJ* 19.93, Suet. *Cal.* 18.2, *Nero* 11.2; tokens: Mart. 8.78.7–12, D.C. 59.9.6, 61.18.1–2, 66.25.5, 67.4.4. Cf. Coleman 1996: 55–56.

[70] Martial uses nuts to characterise the Saturnalia in the first poems both of the *Xenia* (13.1.7) and of the *Apophoreta* (14.1.12); cf. also e.g. 14.185, 5.30.8, 5.84.1, 7.91.2. Mart. 13.23–29 has figs, quinces, pine cones, sorb apples, dates, again figs, and damsons; pastries (including such in human shape) are mentioned at 14.69 (68)–70 (69). Dates and figs are also listed in Statius' later Saturnalian poem, *Silv.* 4.9, at 26.

[71] See Mart. 13. 71–73.

[72] Statius calls Saturnus *antiquus Jupiter* in the same way as he calls Neptune *secundus Jupiter* (*Ach.* 1.48–49). This is an extension of a common way of paraphrasing Pluto as e.g. *Stygius* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.638), *profundus* (*Theb.* 1.615–16), *niger* (*Theb.* 2.49, Sil. 8.116), or *iniquus* (*Silv.* 1.4.94–95) *Iuppiter*; cf. Mulder 154: 64.

There is of course a certain contradiction between this concept of a temporary return of the Golden Age during the Saturnalia, and the idea, discussed above in connection with *Silvae* 4.3, of a lasting return of the Golden Age under the present ruler. In *Silvae* 1.6, there certainly is the suggestion that the bounty displayed at the festival is typical for Domitian's reign as a whole, but the ambiguity surrounding the figure of a Saturnalian ruler is carefully controlled[73]. Domitian is not compared to Saturnus, who was supposed to take over the command from Jupiter during the Saturnalia[74], but, in the very act of dispersing gifts, to Jupiter himself (25–27); likewise, his servants, in the moment of pouring out the wine, are compared to Ganymede, Jupiter's cupbearer (34). In spite of the temporary return of Saturnus' bounty, the emperor still reigns as Jupiter.

The most interesting aspect of Saturnalian ambiguity and its control is the lifting of hierarchical barriers, inclusive of the barrier separating the emperor from his subjects:

> Vna uescitur omnis ordo mensa,
> parui, femina, plebs, eques, senatus:
> libertas reuerentiam remisit.
> Et tu quin etiam (quis hoc uocari,
> quis promittere possit hoc deorum?)
> nobiscum socias dapes inisti. (43–48)

> At one table feasts every rank, children, women, people, knights, senators: (45) liberty has relaxed reverence. And even you (what god could receive this invitation, what god accept it?) have come to share with us a common banquet.

Of course the various social categories did not really dine at one board; on the contrary, legislation by Augustus, renewed by Domitian himself, had assigned specific seats to all the categories mentioned by Statius, and in spite of the Saturnalian character of the occasion, this legislation remained in force, as appears from the way Statius addresses Domitian a few lines earlier[75]:

---

[73] On this ambiguity and its treatment in imperial panegyric see Nauta 1987, Versnel 1992: 190–210.

[74] See e.g. Mart. 14.1.9–10, Luc. *Sat.* 7, Macr. *Sat.* 1.7.26. The removal of his fetters is of course meant to make this possible.

[75] The regulations for seating (and dress) at the theatre and amphitheatre, for which the evidence is incomplete and difficult to interpret, have been extensively

orbem, qua melior seueriorque est,
et gentes alis insemel togatas. (35–36)

you feed the round [of the amphitheatre] where it is better and graver, as well as the peoples in the toga.

Statius here refers to the seats for senators and knights (the "better and graver" element), optically distinguished from those of the common people, who, by a measure of Augustus renewed by Domitian, were obliged to wear white toga's[76]. This was a distinctly un-Saturnalian feature, because at the Saturnalia, the toga, with all its connotations of Roman identity and seriousness, was led aside in favour of the more comfortable *synthesis*[77]. Moreover, the various groups in the amphitheatre, who were distinguished both by dress and by spatial position, may also have received differential treatment in the matter of food and drink: at least this is what is attested for another December festival, the Septimontium, which was likewise celebrated by Domitian with a banquet in the amphitheatre, combined with gladiatorial presentations and the distribution of gifts (Suet. *Dom.* 4.5): here the senators and knights received large baskets (*panaria*) with food, the common people smaller ones (*sportellae*).

The emperor himself sat apart in a seat of honour[78], and the spectators were not deceived as to his position, and acclaimed him as *dominus*, "master". Statius, by a witty paradox, calls this a Saturnalian licence—the only one to be forbidden by the emperor (83–84).

---

discussed; see most notably Rawson 1987 = 1991: 508–45 and (more specifically about the amphitheatre) Edmondson 1996: 86–95. On Domitian's "theatre edict" see further below, p. 431. Ville 1981: 434–35 assumes that the regulations were suspended at the festival described by Statius, but does not consider lines 35–36.

[76] On the measure of Augustus see Suet. *Aug.* 40.5 (referring to the circus, if *circoue* is read) and 44.2 (referring to the theatre and amphitheatre). Augustus' quotation of Verg. *Aen.* 1.282 (*gentemque togatam*), reported by Suetonius (40.5), is echoed both by Statius here and (earlier) by Mart. 14.132.1, apparently referring to a reinstatement of Augustus' legislation by Domitian (cf. Leary 1996: 189). From Mart. 14.135 and 4.2 it appears that a white cloak might be worn over the toga.

[77] On the toga and the *synthesis* at the Saturnalia see p. 169.

[78] Reconstruction of the emperor's seating at the amphitheatre is speculative, in the absence of unambiguous archaeological or literary evidence (the latter collected by Bollinger 1969: 74–77); in any case, Domitian sat in an exposed position (Suet. *Dom.* 4.2).

But Suetonius states that "in the amphitheatre on the day of a public banquet" Domitian was quite happy to be called *dominus* (*Dom.* 13.1). It is generally assumed that this refers to a later occasion, when Domitian had finally given in to the persistence of his flatterers[79]. And indeed emperors often mounted only a token resistance, meant to be overcome. But the interval between refusal and acceptance need not be a matter of years, it may also be a matter of minutes, and possibly this was the case here: perhaps Domitian's reluctance to be called *dominus* was so obviously feigned that a more hostile interpretation (to be made public only after his death) could easily construct it as encouragement[80].

However that may be, Statius' "civil" interpretation of the behaviour of the emperor is combined with an emphatic acknowledgement of his exalted station, just as in *Silvae* 4.2. And, again as in *Silvae* 4.2, the double message was already encoded in the spatial and other arrangements: the emperor dined with his subjects, but he remained aloof in his imperial seat, the focal point of a building symbolising the dominance of himself and his family (the palace built by himself, the amphitheatre built by his father and brother)[81]. It was the combination of the emperor's civility with his superiority that was essential to the image of a harmonious social hierarchy. At the emperor's festivals this image was articulated by means of architecture and ceremony, and in Statius' poetry it was further interpreted and ornamented.

Statius has written yet another poem on imperial games, *Silvae* 2.5, which is different from *Silvae* 1.6 in both its pragmatic context and its theme. The poem concerns a tame lion killed in the amphitheatre, and was offered to the emperor "immediately", as Statius writes in the preface (2.*ep.*16–18). The occasional character of the

---

[79] E.g. Gsell 1893: 49, n. 5; B.W. Jones 1996: 108.

[80] Cf. e.g. Plin. *Pan.* 54.5, 66.3 (and Pliny himself praises Trajan's refutation of a third consulate only to argue against it, at a moment when that third consulate had already been held [56–60]).

[81] Martial implicitly places both buildings in the same category by echoing the beginning of his description of the amphitheatre (*Barbara pyramidum sileat miracula Memphis* [*Sp.* 1.1]) in the beginning of his description of the palace (*Regia pyramidum, Caesar, miracula ride;/ iam tacet Eoum barbara Memphis opus* [9.36.1–2]).

poem manifests itself in an "information gap" which has given rise to much contention among commentators: Statius states that the lion was killed "while a beast was fleeing" (11), without specifying the identity of the other animal or the way in which the killing occurred[82]. The information did not need to be provided in the text, because it had been present in the situational context; later, when Statius published the poem, he refrained from adding specifications, doubtless in order not to compromise the poem's character as an immediate response. Moreover, the essential paradox still comes across: the lion had been trained to catch and then let go weaker creatures (1–6), and now one of these had unexpectedly killed him when fleeing from him[83].

Lions, in Antiquity as now, were much admired for their majesty, their force and ferocity, and were among the most appreciated protagonists of the amphitheatre: fighting with other wild animals as well as with men, and being hunted in so-called *uenationes*[84]. In a number of ways these spectacles symbolised the power of the Roman people, present as spectators, and especially of the Roman emperor, present as the organiser of the games: the regions whence these animals were procured had been conquered and pacified, and the brute forces of a threatening nature brought under control[85]. When tamed lions performed, this symbolism was heightened: a certain *frisson* must have gone through the audience, who were very much exposed to the true nature of lions in other parts of the games. When the lion celebrated by Statius died, that true nature to a certain extent returned (17–18), but still in a controlled way: Statius' comparison is with a soldier (19–23), a representative of violence, but violence in

[82] The various suggestions are tabulated and critically discussed by van Dam 1984: 379–80. On "information gaps" as a sign of earlier use at an occasion see p. 39.

[83] The fleeing animal probably dealt the lion a blow (cf. *ictu*: 16) with the hoof of one of its hind legs; it may well have been an antelope, as suggested by Cancik 1971: 77. Cancik, however, thinks not of a performance of trained animals gone wrong, but of a real fight, in which the possibility of the lion's death was anticipated (79; followed by van Dam 1984: 371).

[84] Cf. in Martial's *Liber spectaculorum*, 21 (18) (a lion against a tigress) and 8 (6b), 17 (15).5–6, 32 (28 [27]).3 (lions being hunted). Further references in van Dam 1984: 370–71.

[85] Cf. e.g. Wiedemann 1992: 62–67.

the service of the emperor. But the manner of death itself could not be accommodated to the symbolism of control over violence: the lion was not slain by a fiercer animal nor by a human fighter or hunter, but accidentally and undeservedly. It was this that created the pathos of the situation[86].

It may well be that tamed lions were seen as in a special sense belonging to the emperor, and that this explains why Statius felt motivated to write this poem for Domitian[87]. Moreover, Domitian seems to have exhibited some marks of emotion upon the death of the animal (27–30), even if perhaps only to show his solidarity with the tears of the audience (25–27), and this gave Statius, as one of the audience, the opportunity to celebrate the emperor's reaction as both entirely appropriate and extraordinarily merciful. Statius was not in a position to console the emperor—that would presuppose a personal relationship that was not there—, and does not do so, even though the poem is largely structured as a consolation[88]. It begins by praising and mourning the deceased, goes on to recount the manner of his death, and finally articulates "solace" (24), consisting in the fact that the lion has been mourned by the entire audience and even by Domitian himself (25–30). Both universal mourning and the sorrow of the emperor are familiar consolatory motifs, but Statius gives them an unexpected twist: it is not Domitian he consoles, but the lion itself, about its own death, made more bearable "because the emperor's features were touched by the loss of one single lion" (27–30). So we see the same ambivalence about the emperor's behaviour as in the poems discussed earlier: his show of emotion is presented as a sign of the common humanity he shares with his subjects, but also as a singular favour, which may earn even a brute beast a celebratory poem[89].

---

86 For a different analysis of violence and mourning in this poem see Cancik 1971: 78–81.

87 Cf. Martial's words about such a tamed lion (addressed to Domitian): *esse tuus dicitur* (1.14.6), and the analysis given below, pp. 408–411, of the "lions-hares-cycle".

88 On *Silv.* 2.5 as a *consolatio* cf. van Dam 1984, esp. 369 and 385.

89 One may perhaps compare the tears Titus shed in the Colosseum, *populo coram* (Suet. *Tit.* 10.1), ὥστε πάντα τὸν δῆμον ἰδεῖν (D.C. 66.26.1): apparently, these attracted much comment.

The symbolic potential of events in the amphitheatre was also exploited by Martial, most thoroughly so in a collection of epigrams he wrote about the games given by Titus in 80 for the inauguration of the Amphitheatrum Flavium (better known by its Mediaeval designation as "the Colosseum")[90]. Even if this work strictly spoken falls outside the scope of the present study, the similarities with Martial's Domitianic epigrams will justify a brief discussion. The collection survives incomplete and without a title, and I shall refer to it by one of its conventional titles as the *Liber spectaculorum*, or *Spectacula* for short; other current names are *Liber de spectaculis* and *Epigrammaton liber*)[91]. Although the book is mutilated, we can see that Martial gave no systematic or complete account of the games, but concentrated, in accordance with the genre he was writing in, on such events as provided opportunity for paradox and wit. These might be unexpected occurrences or unconventional interventions of the emperor (as presider of the games), but more often were happenings that had been engineered by the organisers to surprise and astonish the audience: paradox and wit were already built into the proceedings[92]. Martial's pointed style, here as elsewhere, is in the service of realism, rather than in opposition to it[93].

One element of Titus' games to which Martial pays much attention is the staging of executions (which formed a regular part of *munera*) as re-enactments of mythological stories[94]. In so far as mythology is improbable or even incredible, its "realisation" in the amphitheatre is a manifestation of the miraculous power of the emperor.

---

[90] Brief and accessible discussions of the building can be found i.a. in Darwall-Smith 1996: 76–90 and Claridge 1998: 276–83.

[91] On the *Liber spectaculorum*, see (until the appearance of Kathleen Coleman's new commentary) Carratello 1980: 11–64, Ville 1981: 144–48 (a detailed comparison with the description of the games in Suet. *Tit.* 7.3 and D.C. 66.25), Coleman 1998b.

[92] Sometimes it is unclear whether something really was an unexpected accident or whether it had been rigged, e.g. in the case of the sow giving birth through a wound: 14–16 (12–14); cf. Coleman 1998b: 23–24. For unconventional interventions of the emperor see 23 (20) and 31 (27 [29]).

[93] Cf. on the relationship between realism and point in Martial Citroni 1969.

[94] On this type of punishment (first attested under Nero) see the thorough study of Coleman 1990. On the theme of mythology in the *Spectacula* also Weinreich 1928: 29–73.

The following poem, on a woman representing Pasiphae being raped (and doubtless killed) by a bull, is typical for Martial's technique:

> Iunctam Pasiphaen Dictaeo credite tauro:
> uidimus, accepit fabula prisca fidem.
> Nec se miretur, Caesar, longaeua uetustas:
> quidquid fama canit, praestat harena tibi. (6 [5])

> Believe that Pasiphae was coupled with a Cretan bull: we have seen it, the ancient myth has been confirmed. And let not aged antiquity admire itself, Caesar: whatever the tradition sings of, your arena affords you.

The spectacle involves something which goes against the ordinary course of nature, and it is thus expressive of power *over* nature. Another manifestation of such power, which Martial did not neglect to exploit, is the interchange of land and sea, which was a conspicuous feature of the games: aquatic displays took place in the Colosseum (which had been fitted with a shallow basin), whereas chariot races, beast hunts and gladiatorial fights were held in a large artificial lake, the *stagnum Augusti* (which was partly planked for the purpose)[95]. But the most significant kind of control over nature exercised by the emperor is the "spontaneous" adoration offered to him by the animals in the arena. Of course in reality this behaviour was trained, but because it was presented as spontaneous, it identified the emperor as a god, whose supernatural power (*numen*) was felt by the animals. So, when an elephant is seen kneeling in front of the imperial box, Martial emphatically denies the involvement of a trainer[96]:

> non facit hoc iussus, nulloque docente magistro:
> crede mihi, nostrum sentit et ille deum. (20 [17].3–4)

> he [the elephant] does not do this to order, and not through the teaching of any trainer. Believe me, he too is aware of our god.

Interestingly enough, however, Martial includes two poems in which animals do *not* behave tamely, although they are expected to. In poem 12 (10) a lion attacks his trainer, in 21 (18) a tigress tears up

---

[95] *Sp*. 27 (24)–30 (26) and 34 (30 [28]). See Coleman 1993: 51–54, 58–67 for the logistics and 68–69 for interpretation.

[96] Similarly 33 (29 [30]). On the theme of "the animals and the emperor's *numen*" see Weinreich 1928: 74–165.

a lion, which she would not have dared to do in her natural state. In both cases Martial cannot assert the mitigating influence of the emperor, but has to find a different point to his epigram. In 21 (18) he distances the tigress' violence from the emperor, connecting it instead with "us": "since she has been among us, she has more ferocity" (6). "We" have a tendency to violence, and therefore need a disciplinary instance, which is precisely what the emperor provides: in 12 (10) the lion is *punished*, and Martial draws the moral for "us" humans:

> Quos decet esse hominum tali sub principe mores,
> qui iubet ingenium mitius esse feris! (12 [10].5–6)

> What should the behaviour of humans be under such an emperor, who prescribes a milder nature to the beasts!

Generally, of course, the beasts in the arena are not "mild", and not expected to be, so that in any case the emperor's mildness is surrounded by an enormous amount of violence, which he, however, controls.

In gladiatorial fights this control was demonstrated in a straightforward manner: when a gladiator could no longer defend himself, he would beg for mercy; the crowd would either support his request or demand him to be killed, but it was the emperor who took the final decision[97]. The surviving *Liber spectaculorum* contains one poem in which Martial relates how Titus, against the expressed wishes of he crowd, forced two gladiators to fight on, until they both succumbed at the same time—but then he declared both victorious:

> Contigit hoc nullo nisi sub te principe, Caesar:
> cum duo pugnarent, uictor uterque fuit. (31 [27 (29)].11–12)

> This has happened under no emperor but you, Caesar: when two fought, both were the victor.

This couplet displays in combination the various aspects I have been discussing: it establishes Titus' title to fame by stating that he surpasses all other emperors, it uses epigrammatic point to articulate the paradoxical—and therefore admirable—character of what happens; and it demonstrates that Titus' control over violence is both unre-

---

97 On the procedure cf. Ville 1981: 410–24, for sociological interpretation e.g. Hopkins 1983: 18.

lenting and clement. In addition, it is shown that in the negotiations between people and emperor, the emperor has the power of bypassing the people's wishes, but does so only for their final good—so that the people can accept, and even admire, this greater power of the emperor.

In the books written under Domitian, the spectacles of the amphitheatre recur as themes for Martial's epigrams, if not frequently. There are only two clusters: a number of poems in Book 8, having to do with the celebrations of Domitian's victory over the Sarmatians, and a "cycle" of seven poems in Book 1 on the play of tamed lions and hares[98]. These lions had been trained to do the same trick as the lion mourned by Statius: "to desist of their own accord when the prey had already been captured" (Silv. 2.5.5). In the first poem of the cycle (1.6), which has already been quoted at the beginning of this chapter, the lions' behaviour is praised as a miracle, which can only be explained by assuming divine powers in Domitian, but in the second epigram another explanation is also brought into play:

> Vnde potest auidus captae leo parcere praedae?
> Sed tamen esse tuus dicitur: ergo potest. (1.14.5–6)

> How can the greedy lion spare the captured prey? But he is said to be yours: that is why he can.

This suggests not so much that the lion's natural impulses have been suppressed by Domitian's supernatural force, but rather that the lion follows the emperor's example in being magnanimous. In the third poem this thought is then more clearly articulated:

> Seruantur magnis isti ceruicibus ungues
> nec gaudet tenui sanguine tanta sitis.
> Praeda canum lepus est, uastos non implet hiatus:
> non timeat Dacus Caesaris arma puer. (1.22.3–6)

> These claws are saved for big necks, and so large a thirst does not enjoy small blood. (5) A hare is prey for dogs, it does not fill huge jaws: Caesar's arms need not be feared by a Dacian boy.

---

[98] Book 8: 26, 30, 53 (55), 78, 80; other poems on the amphitheatre: 4.2–3, 35, 74; 5.65; 9.83; 10.25. For the concept of "cycle" and the possibility that the "lions-hares-cycle" was offered to the emperor as a collection (like the *Liber spectaculorum*) see pp. 368–371.

Here the lion's magnanimity seems an entirely natural characteristic, which is coupled with his strength: small animals have nothing to fear, but large animals have. This is parallel to the emperor's magnanimity: Dacian boys have nothing to fear, but Dacian men—this is the unspoken implication—have.

It seems that Martial has tried to harness to his panegyric two divergent and inconsistent views of the nature of lions. On the one hand lions were notorious for their ferocity, and as such were among the chief performers in the arena. On the other hand there was a body of lore, represented especially in fable, which attributed to the lion a noble disdain for small prey[99]. Such nobility could be held up as an example to rulers, as was done by Ovid (*Tr.* 3.5.33–34) in his quality as supplicant and by Seneca in his quality as teacher (*Cl.* 1.5.5). But the same Seneca, in the same work, also uses the behaviour of the lion in the amphitheatre as an example of cruelty and bestiality (1.25.1): in the one context the relationship between lion and king is one of analogy, in the other one of contrast (1.26.3). So both of Martial's interpretations of the lions' behaviour were prefigured in the tradition.

The first group of three epigrams is followed at some distance (at least in the published book) by a second group of three (1.48, 51, 60), in which the motif of large versus small victims, introduced in the last epigram of the first group (1.22.3–4) is elaborated: the hares were released from the same jaws which before had devoured mighty bulls. Again after some distance, a final epigram follows (1.104), longer than the preceding ones and in a different metre (hendecasyllables instead of elegiac distichs). The first half of the poem takes up the theme of force subdued by greater force: various examples are adduced of wild animals which have been tamed, bridled, subjugated, brought under the yoke; the enumeration is rounded off by the (rhetorical) question "who would not think that these were spectacles of the gods?" (11)[100]. The second half of the poem opens with the

[99] The tension between an "aretological" and an "ethological" approach in Martial was seen by Weinreich 1928: 92–94; cf. also Weinreich 1931 = 1969–75: 2.391–92 on fable (noting Babr. 107; cf. also 102).

[100] The phrase *spectacula deorum* is usually translated in the sense "sights ... for the gods" (Shackleton Bailey 1993: 1.121), but the parallel with the influence of the

statement that these are still minor in comparison to the play of the lions and the hares, which is then described; again it is stressed that the lions are "ashamed to crush a gentle quarry, when they have come fresh from laying steers low" (19–20). The last couplet gives the explanation:

> Haec clementia non paratur arte,
> sed norunt cuï seruiant leones. (1.104.21–22)

> This clemency is not acquired by training, but the lions know whom they serve.

In contrast to the animals described in the first half of the poem, the lions do not require the intervention of *ars*. Of course lions cannot become tame without training, but that is suppressed by Martial, in order to hint at the emperor's numinous power (which puts him above the gods who were responsible for the taming of the other animals). Because the lions "know whom they serve", they acquire his *clementia*. With this word, artfully retained until the very end, Martial identifies the ideological notion which is central to the cycle. *Clementia* is a virtue of rulers, theorised by Seneca in his *De clementia* (addressed to Nero), and it closely bound up with the ruler's power[101]. Basically, it is the virtue of sparing defeated enemies; therefore it presupposes victory. Accordingly, Martial always stresses that the hares are spared after they have been caught[102]. And the serious enemies, the bulls, are caught and *not* spared.

So the lions-hares-cycle is a reassuring, but at the same time an intimidating representation of the power of the emperor. Some scholars have discovered in it a more straightforward allegory, in which the hares do not in a general way represent those subject to the power of the emperor (as Martial's comparison with the Dacian boys suggests), but more specifically stand for Martial himself, the practi-

---

emperor in 21–22 (see below) strongly suggests that the gods are seen as producers, not as spectators. Cf. 1.6.5–6: *miracula Caesaris* and *Iouis* compared.

[101] On *clementia* and its connection with power see esp. the analysis by Plass 1995: 116–21 (119 on the lions-hares-cycle). Weinreich 1028: 94 and Howell 1980: 57

[102] In all poems of the cycle it is stressed that the hares are in the mouths of the lions: *ore* (1.6.4), *dente, ora* (1.14.3, 4), *ora* (1.22.1), *rictibus, ora* (1.48.1, 8), *dentes* (1.51.2), *ora, dente* (1.60.1, 2), *ore, rictus, dentes* (1.104.16, 17, 18).

tioner of a genre which is small and playful, just like the hares[103]. However, the correspondences are both less exact and less complete than such an allegory would demand: in the epigrams, the playing is done by the lions (1.14.1, 44.1) just as well as the hares (1.6.4), and no allegorical equivalents can be found for the bulls, whom the lions *do* devour (surely not epic or tragic poets), or the dogs, from whom the hares are *not* safe (surely not critics)[104]. However, the allegory is not proposed in order to present Martial as grateful for an exceptional clemency granted himself or his genre, but to present him as covertly "critical": his intention would be to draw attention to the mortal danger hovering over himself and his poetry[105]. Now although this goes at first sight against the grain of the texts, where the central motif is precisely *the safety* of the hares, it cannot be simply dismissed, because it gains plausibility from the position which the lions-hare-cycle occupies within the structure of the book. The cycle begins with 1.6, and so follows immediately on the pair 1.4 and 1.5 (discussed at the beginning of this chapter), in which Martial defends the light-hearted character of his work against the assumed disapproval of Domitian, only to be answered by a threat (albeit a jocular one) that he and his book will be thrown into the water. So a certain anxiety of the poet about the attitude of the emperor is undeniable, and this anxiety may carry over into the following poem and into the cycle which that poem begins. If so, the effect must have been intended or at least accepted by Martial, whose ordering of his poems in this prooemial part of his *corpus* is evidently very careful[106]. But it was a *secondary* effect, because in all probability, the cycle had originally been offered as a small separate collection to Domitian[107].

---

[103]This was suggested, apparently independently of each other, by Ahl 1984a: 85–86 and Holzberg 1986: 209–10 (who credits his students), and then elaborated in Holzberg 1988: 76–79.

[104] Ahl 1984a: 86 does indeed suggest that the hounds are "the poet's most threatening critics — perhaps the senatorial *litterati*".

[105] The hypothesis might perhaps have been strengthened by a reference to Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.73–75, where living with a tyrant (in this case Caligula) is compared to taming a lion, teaching it *reddere ab ore manus et nulla uiuere praeda* (75). Similarly (with a more general reference to tyrants) D.Chr. 6.59.

[106] The argument from order is stressed by Holzberg 1988: 76; cf. 36–37.

[107] See pp. 368–370.

Whether in its original form it already conveyed Martial's fears and even implicit criticisms to the emperor is more difficult to decide. Because such questions arise more often, it will be useful to pay special attention to the possible ambivalencies and hidden messages in the poets' ostensible praise of the emperor.

Subversion or Support?

On 1 September of the year 100, Pliny the Younger took up his suffect consulship by delivering in the Senate the obligatory formal speech of thanks to the emperor; subsequently, he revised and expanded this speech, and published it as the text which is now known as the *Panegyricus Traiani*, "Panegyric on Trajan"[108]. Apart from *performing* praise, this work extensively *reflects on* praise: on its conditions, constraints, and dilemma's. The reason is obvious: in the very recent past, both Pliny himself and his senatorial audience had abundantly praised Domitian, the emperor they now depicted as an arrogant tyrant and contrasted with Trajan, "the best emperor" (*optimus princeps* [2.7, 88.4]). So Pliny tried to demonstrate that the former praise of Domitian had been as insincere as the present praise of Trajan was sincere.

But a profession of sincerity may well be a technique of flattery, and in fact in the recent past often had been. And so it happens that in the very act of distancing himself from the practices of earlier reigns, Pliny inevitably recalls and to a great extent repeats those practices[109]. Thus, in the very beginning of his speech, he claims that he has no need to feign; his only problem will be to temper his own enthusiasm, in order not to offend the emperor's modesty: "I will no less consider what his ears can tolerate than what his virtues require" (3.2). This is the same figure as the one used by Martial, when he explained to Domitian in the preface of his eighth book that he had kept down the number of honorific poems, "lest your heavenly restraint be burdened with praises (which can more easily fatigue you

[108] On the speech, its revision and publication see Durry 1938: 3–15. The title *Panegyricus* is probably not authentic.

[109] For a good analysis of the *Panegyricus* and its paradoxes see Bartsch 1994: 148-87, 273–87.

than satiate us) from every verse" (8.*ep*.9–10). A few lines later, Pliny compares Trajan's attitude to that of the gods, who rejoice when worshippers approach their sanctuaries with "a pure and chaste mind" (3.5). Again, Martial had drawn a similar analogy, writing that one should "remember that only those who are cleansed by a ritual purification are allowed to approach temples" (16–17). Not only does Pliny's religious language undercut his emphatic statement that Trajan does not want to be flattered as a god (2.3), it also reproduces the form that such flatteries took under the emperor with whom Trajan is implicitly contrasted.

Between the two quotations from the beginning of the *Panegyricus* that I have given, Pliny makes a revealing comment on the conditions of praise under Domitian, as always by implicit contrast with the situation under Trajan:

> Non enim periculum est ne, cum loquar de humanitate, exprobrari sibi superbiam credat; cum de frugalitate, luxuriam; cum de clementia, crudelitatem; cum de liberalitate, auaritiam; cum de benignitate, liuorem; cum de continentia, libidinem; cum de labore, inertiam; cum de fortitudine, timorem. (3.4)

> For there is no danger that, when I speak of his affability, he believes that he is being criticised for arrogance; of his frugality, for dissipation; of his clemency, for cruelty; of his generosity, for avarice; of his kindness, for malice; of his self-control, for lust; of his labour, for sloth; of his courage, for cowardice.

This passage has been read as a confirmation that literary praise of Domitian, such as Martial's, contained hidden criticisms[110], but that is too simple an interpretation. For if this were Pliny's statement, the implication would be that Domitian's suspicions were entirely justified. The implied contrast with the situation under Trajan is not one of types of criticism, but one of imperial reactions: whereas it was pleasant to honour Trajan, who knew that he merited his praise, there was danger involved in lauding Domitian, who was aware that he did not possess the virtues attributed to him, and therefore feared that the discourse must really be about his vices. As Pliny put it later on in his text: even when the senators behaved in a loving manner, bad

[110] Cf. Garthwaite 1978: 9–10, Holzberg 1988: 76. A more subtle reading is given by Bartsch 1994: 156, 170.

emperors could never believe that they were loved (74.3). This is a standard *topos* in the depiction of tyrants [111], which was applied to Domitian by others as well. Thus Dio Cassius said of him: "he hated those who paid court to him ..., because they seemed to flatter (θωπεύειν)" (67.4.2). And Dio Chrysostom may likewise have been thinking of Domitian, when he had Diogenes remark of the tyrant: "He does not like to be praised; for he does not think that those who praise him are sincere (φρονοῦντας οὕτως)" (6.59).

This is not to say, however, that Domitian's mistrust was entirely irrational. For it was well understood in Antiquity that honorific acts could easily have the effect of ridiculing the person who was ostensibly honoured[112]. Pliny himself gives an example in the *Panegyricus*, when he writes that Nero deified his predecessor Claudius "in order to make fun of him" (*ut irrideret*: 11.1). The reason that this interpretation is possible, is that the honour is felt to be grossly exaggerated, so that an incongruity is perceived between what is pretended and what one knows to be the truth. Dio Cassius spells out the principle involved[113]:

> ἄν ... τις ἐπὶ μηδεμιᾷ ἢ μικρᾷ τινι ἀνδραγαθίᾳ ἤτοι ἐπαίνους μεγάλους ἢ καὶ τιμὰς ἐξαισίους ποιῆται, διαμωκᾶσθαί τε καὶ διασιλλοῦν αὐτὴν ὑποπτεύεται. (59.25.4)
>
> If anybody bestows great praises or excessive honours upon an insignificant or only minor achievement, he is suspected of deriding and satirising it.

Now exaggeration *eo ipso* belongs to flattery, and, moreover, it has a tendency to increase over time: habituation creates the need for ever stronger doses. This tendency is compounded by the competitive character of flattery: because at any given time, there will be various persons competing for the favours of the monarch, they will each try to surpass the other in flattery[114]. So it will be difficult, both for contemporary observers and for later historians, to decide when the ex-

---

111 The *topos* goes back to Herodotus (3.80).

112 This is discussed by Bartsch 1994 as the instability of the "praise/ blame axis" (169–80).

113 Cf. also the advice he makes Maecenas give to Augustus at 52.35.

114 These mechanisms were already analysed in ancient historiography: see Vielberg 1987: 98–101 for Tacitus and 1996: 57 for Dio Cassius.

aggeration is so extreme as to turn the flattery into its opposite[115]. Whether this happens or not cannot be completely controlled by the author of the flattery: as Dio makes clear, he "is suspected" of mocking what he ostensibly praises, independently from what his intention may have been[116].

We have seen above that according to Pliny, the ridicule attaching to Claudius' apotheosis was indeed intended by Nero. On the other hand, Tacitus, describing a very similar occasion, the funeral oration held by Nero in Claudius' honour, implies that the laughter raised on that occasion was *not* intended. The audience, Tacitus reports, was serious and receptive, as long as Nero extolled Claudius' ancestors, his learning, and the freedom from foreign attack during his reign; "but when he turned to his foresight and wisdom, nobody could control their laughter, although the speech, written by Seneca, displayed great refinement" (*Ann.* 13.3.1). It is difficult, if perhaps not impossible, to determine whether Tacitus or Pliny was right[117], but in any case it is important to realise that this question already arose in the period itself. In a sense, intention did not matter: when a subversive meaning had been recognised (at least when it had been publicly recognised), the damage to the emperor's reputation had already been done[118]. After that, it was largely at the emperor's discretion whether he attributed intention to the author, and whether he meted out punishment.

It was often urged upon emperors that the best reaction would be to refuse to believe that criticism had been implied, because ac-

---

[115] Similar considerations apply to other techniques that might be used to conceal criticism (as studied most notably in Bartsch 1994), such as the construction of contradictions within the flattering utterance or between the flattering utterance and the frame in which it occurs: when are the contradictions glaring enough to undermine the utterance's ostensible meaning?

[116] On the importance of the attribution of meaning by the audience irrespective of the author's intention cf. Bartsch 1994, esp. 63–97.

[117] For an argument that, although Nero privately enjoyed mockery of Claudius' apotheosis in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, it would have been imprudent for him to distance himself publicly from his official policy towards Claudius' memory, see Griffin 1976: 129–33, 416; on the Tacitus-passage cf. also Plass 1988: 8.

[118] The emperor's power might coerce those who recognised a subversive meaning into not making their perception public. In such a case the emperor's honour would remain intact; cf. Lendon 1997: 52–54.

knowledging it might be taken as revealing a guilty conscience; also, that punishment was inadvisable, because it would only create martyrs and increase the authority of oppositional opinions[119]. But because emperors could not allow their honour to be slighted, they all punished criticisms, as soon as these had become publicly recognised, even if some emperors were more lenient than others[120]. Domitian was among those who reacted harshly. The instances transmitted by the historical record do not concern allusions detected in panegyrical texts, but in texts that presented themselves as "neutral", as literary exercises in well-established genres, using well-established motifs. Dio Cassius reports that Domitian killed a rhetorician called Maternus, "because he had spoken against tyrants in a declamation" (67.12.5)[121]. According to Suetonius, the younger Helvidius was executed, "because in a stage farce he had allegedly used the masks of Paris and Oenone to censure Domitian's divorce from his wife" (*Dom.* 10.4). And another victim was Hermogenes from Tarsus "on account of some *figurae* in his history" (*Dom.* 10.1). The term *figurae* is explained in a passage from Quintilian, which in recent scholarship has sometimes been seen as the key to the question of hidden criticism in the age of Domitian, and which therefore now needs to be discussed in some detail[122].

After discussing the figure of *emphasis*, "when from something which is said something hidden is brought to light" (*Inst.* 9.2.64), Quintilian turns to a figure which is "related or rather the same", "in which by means of a certain innuendo (*suspicio*) we want something to be understood that we do not say, not exactly the opposite, as in irony, but something hidden, which as it were should be found by the

---

[119] Thus Maecenas in Dio Cassius in his advice to Augustus (52.31.6–8), and Cremutius Cordus in Tacitus: *spreta exolescunt: si irascare, adgnita uidentur* (*Ann.* 4.34.5), as well as Tacitus himself, commenting on Cordus' condemnation: *punitis ingeniis gliscit auctoritas* (4.35.5).

[120] For a survey of such persecutions under the Early Empire see Salles 1986; for the emperors' motives Lendon 1997: 118–19.

[121] This Maternus is probably not identical with the Curiatius Maternus of Tacitus' *Dialogus*, whose tragedies contained (intended) political subversion and who may have been executed by Vespasian. For a brief survey of the discussion see Bartsch 1994: 105–106 (with notes).

[122] See esp. Ahl 1984a: 82–84 and 1984b: 187–196. My treatment will be seen to differ strongly from his (and less strongly from Bartsch 1994: 93–97).

audience" (65). This figure is simply called *figura*, or with the Greek term *schema*[123], and has three uses: when open speech is not safe, when it is not fitting, and when indirect expression is preferable for stylistic reasons (66). These three uses are then successively elaborated[124], but for the present discussion only the first is relevant.

This use, Quintilian states, is frequent in the schools of declamation. He refers to a stock theme, in which a tyrant abdicates on condition that it will be a capital offence to reproach him with his former tyranny; the ex-tyrant then runs for office against the speaker (67)[125]. Under these circumstances, the only way the speaker may safely attack his opponent's past is by allusion. But the allusion needs not to be hidden:

> quamlibet enim apertum, quod modo et aliter intellegi possit, in illos tyrannos bene dixeris, quia periculum tantum, non offensa uitatur. (67)

> for however openly you speak against those tyrants, as long as your words can also be taken differently, you will have spoken well, because it is only danger that is avoided, not offence.

In the "real business" (*uera negotia*) in the forum, however, the situation is different. It may be that one has to plead a case it which it is necessary to criticise "powerful characters" (*personae potentes*), but then offence may *not* be given, and the allusion, therefore, may *not* be open. This makes the technique very difficult to handle, and Quintilian insists that it should be used carefully and sparingly. Yet he recognises that sometimes there is no other option, and he ends by giving an account of how he himself once employed the figure to good effect in an inheritance suit (68–75).

---

123 Cf. 9.1.14, where Quintilian attributes this narrow definition of *schema* to the fourth-century Greek author Zoilus (cf. Phoeb. *Fig.* 1.1 [3.44 Sp.]), and adds that it is widely accepted. The word is used with the same meaning as in Quintilian in Demetr. *Eloc.* 287–95.

124 See chapters 67–75, 76–95, and 96–99, respectively.

125 The situation (which is taken up again at the end of the section, at 97) is defined more explicitly by Seneca Rhetor: *Tyrannus dominationem sub abolitione deposuit et si quis obiecisset tyrannidem capite puniretur. Petit magistratum; competitor contradicit* (*Contr.* 5.8 *thema*). Cf. further [Quint.] *Decl. min.* 267 (where see the commentary by M. Winterbottom), Julius Rufinianus p. 59 H., Fortunatianus 1.3.6, pp. 85–86 H., Philostr. *VS* 569.

In how far can Quintilian's discussion be read as itself an instance of *figura*, commenting on the use of allusion in order to criticise the emperors[126]? Tyrants and their cruelty belonged to the stock-in-trade of declamation, yet occasionally—as we have seen—declaimers might be punished for "speaking against tyrants".[127] But the situation imagined by Quintilian seems too different from the situation of contemporary authors with respect to the emperor to yield relevant associations: here we have not tyrants, but former tyrants, whom, moreover, it is perfectly safe to offend (as long as the condition of ambiguity is met)[128]. If there is an analogy, it is rather with the situation of the orators and their need to criticise "powerful characters"; the phrase "powerful characters" itself might well suggest those having influence with the emperor[129]. But if this is so, we will expect the hidden criticisms we might detect in the poets to be very well hidden indeed, because (as Quintilian specifies) detection meant giving offence. And we have seen that when offence was given, Domitian showed no mercy.

---

[126] In Demetr. *Eloc.* 287–95 political relevance is more immediately present, because the use of σχῆμα is illustrated from interactions with historical (not fictional) tyrants. But whether reference to Roman emperors is conceivable depends on the date, which is very uncertain (serious proposals range from ca. 270 B.C.E. to the first century C.E.; cf. D.C. Innes in the new Loeb-edition, 313–321).

[127] Apart from the case of Maternus, mentioned above, there is also the one of Carrinas Secundus under Gaius (D.C. 59.20.6). The importance of tyranny as a motif in declamation may be illustrated from the fact that the words *tyrannus*, *tyrannis*, and *tyrannicida* occur 280 times in Seneca Rhetor, 160 times in the *Declamationes minores* perhaps from the school of Quintilian, 21 times in the pseudo-Quintilianic *Declamationes maiores*, and 25 times in Calpurnius Flaccus (and 35 times in the *Institutio oratoria* itself, mostly in references to declamation).

[128] Yet Bauman 1974: 162–63 suggests that one of Quintilian's examples is a modification of one of the *figurae* in Hermogenes' history, and that the prohibition of charging ex-tyrants with their former tyranny is an allusion to the condemnation of Aelius Lamia for an offence against Domitian which he had committed many years ago (Suet. *Dom.* 10.2). But the first of these suggestions is entirely speculative and the second reverses the roles of tyrant and victim.

[129] The need that orators sometimes have of offending *potent(ior)es* is mentioned elsewhere by Quintilian (*Inst.* 2.20.8), as well as by Aper in Tacitus' *Dialogus* (10.8). But note that in the same *Dialogus* Curiatius Maternus is said to *offendisse potentium animos* with his allusive tragedy *Cato* (*Dial.* 2.1). Other contexts in Tacitus where the word *potentes* denotes the emperor and/or his court are *Hist.* 1.22.1, *Ann.* 6.48.1, 12.42.3, 16.19.3.

If praise does not include hidden criticism, does that imply that it is "sincere"? To answer this question, it is important to recognise that the term "sincerity" operates at two levels: at the level of the speech act and at the level of content[130]. At the level of the speech act praise is "sincere" if it is meant as praise, and not at the same time as criticism. But at the level of content such praise does not need to be "sincere" in the sense that the author believes in the truth of what he says. Because the effectivity of the praise does not depend on it, "sincerity" at this level is largely a private matter. In general it is difficult for people to live with the idea that they are insincere, and they often adapt their beliefs to fit what they say. But if what they say is quite obviously coerced, or if it quite obviously furthers their interests, people may find it easier to stick to their convictions, because they have such a good reason for their insincerity[131]. If this is the case, they will consider their praise as "flattery:", and so may others who understand the situation, including the person flattered. This will function well until the flattery is revealed as flattery (in the specific sense of "insincere praise"): then the praise is no longer credible, and the honour of the person praised is compromised rather than enhanced.

It is of some importance who does or does not do the revealing: the flatterer, the person flattered or the larger audience. This may be illustrated from a well-known passage in Juvenal that is often adduced in discussions of flattery. Juvenal describes how a fisherman catches an exceptionally large fish and then offers it to Domitian:

> "Ipse capi uoluit." Quid apertius? Et tamen illi
> surgebant cristae. Nihil est quod credere de se
> non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas. (Juv. 4.69–71)

> "It wished itself to be caught." What could be more obvious? And yet his crest began to rise. When a power like to the gods is lauded, there is nothing it cannot believe of itself.

---

[130] The point is made (in slightly different terms) and illustrated from the proem of Lucan in Dewar 1994, esp. 201–02.

[131] Similarly, others will more easily forgive flattery if they understand that it was done for a purpose. Tac. *Ann.* 3.57.2 reports that Q. Haterius was despised for his flattery of Tiberius, because, being already an old man, he had nothing to gain from it (*deridiculo fuit, senex foedissimae adulationis tantum infamia usurus*).

The flattery of the fisherman is of a type we have already encountered in Martial's amphitheatre poems: even the animals are drawn to the emperor, and in this way testify to his supernatural power[132]. Upon sober consideration, the notion is absurd, and this is what Juvenal means by "What could be more obvious?": because the distance to observable reality is so great, the flattery can easily be recognised for what it is[133]. Yet Domitian accepts and even believes it, and this earns him Juvenal's contempt[134]. It was expected of rulers (and of highplaced persons generally) that they could see through flattery, in order not to be vulnerable to manipulation by their flatterers, who would reinforce their vices rather than correct them (as true friends would)[135]. In this case, Domitian does not see through the flattery, although Juvenal, as a third-person observer, does.

But what about the flatterer himself, the fisherman (if for the moment we treat him as a real person rather than as a fictional character)? We cannot know whether he really believed that the fish "wished to be caught", but his flattery would work either way. Even if he was not sincere at the level of content, he must have been sincere at the level of the speech act, for it surely was his intention to flatter, not to criticise: his personal safety was at stake (cf. 45–55), as well as his material interest in a recompense. Nevertheless, he may have hoped that others would recognise that he did not mean what he

---

[132] See above, p. 406. An even closer parallel would be Mart. 4.30, where it is precisely fish who come to Domitian. For an extensive discussion of the topic see Weinreich 1928: 74–165.

[133] Cf. Cic. *Lael.* 99: *Aperte ... adulantem nemo non uidet nisi qui admodum est excors. Apertus* means "easily recognisable" (flattery as being flattery, innuendo as being innuendo), not, as Ahl (1984a: 81–84, 1984b: 193) argues, "allusive" or "figured".

[134] Similarly, Tacitus uttered contempt for Domitian, because the latter rejoiced at being made co-heir in Agricola's testament: *tam caeca et corrupta mens adsiduis adulationibus erat, ut nesciret a bono patre non scribi heredem nisi malum principem* (*Agr.* 43.4).

[135] These are the themes of the widespread literature about "how to distinguish a flatterer from a friend" (*perpetua illa... disputatio*, as it is called at Q. Cic. *Pet.* 39). The best-known examples are Cic. *Lael.* 88–100, Sen. *Nat.* 4a.*pr.*, Plu. *Quom. adul.* (Πῶς ἄν τις διακρίνειε τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου), and Max. Tyr. 14 (Τίσιν χωριστέον τὸν κόλακα τοῦ φίλου). Plutarch sometimes draws his examples from Roman emperors: Tiberius at 60c, Nero at 56f and 60e.

said, and he may even have chosen an exceptionally blatant exaggeration to put it beyond doubt that he *was* exaggerating. In this manner, he would draw attention to the fact that Domitian accepted, or even required, extravagant flattery, and this in itself might be constructed as criticism[136], even if it was not necessarily intended that way: the fisherman may have been more interested in salvaging his own self-respect than in attacking the person who put that self-respect to the test. On the other hand, he may indeed have wanted to provoke such comments as Juvenal's, and to the degree that that would be true, his flattery would no longer be sincere at the level of the speech act. But as long as we have only his words to go by, it is impossible to decide which was the case. And Juvenal does not provide any additional information, because he is interested in evaluating the behaviour of Domitian, not of the fisherman: he does not say whether he regards the fisherman as Domitian's accomplice in the project of flattery, or as his own accomplice in the project of exposing flattery.

Such considerations as the above form the necessary background to a discussion of the question whether or not poems ostensibly praising the emperor contain hidden criticisms. The notion that they indeed do contain such criticisms has been advanced most notably by Frederic Ahl, whose examples concern Augustan and Neronian poets as well as Flavian ones[137]. But because of the focus of my book, I will limit myself to his remarks on Statius, and complement these with the more extensive interpretations of Martial as well as Statius by Ahl's former pupil John Garthwaite[138]. Between them, they deal mainly (if not exclusively) with three groups of texts: the first poem

---

[136] This would be criticism at the level of the speech act (the need to flatter), not at the level of contents (as when e.g. praise of mildness would be read as criticism of cruelty).

[137] See Ahl 1984a (partly overlapping with 1984b and already anticipated in 1976, esp. 25–35). Both before and after Ahl, many others have taken similar approaches; surveys are given by Benker 1987: 26–46 (pro) and Römer 1994 (contra). Additional bibliographical indications in Bartsch 1994: 236, n. 13 and (on the proem of Lucan) 1997: 173–74, n. 46.

[138] Portions of Garthwaite's unpublished dissertation from 1978 have been published in revised form as articles over the years: see Garthwaite 1984, 1989, 1990, 1993, and (substantially new) 1998. Garthwaite has been followed by Holzberg 1988: 74–85, who in his turn has been followed by others (e.g. Fein 1994: 90–91).

of the *Silvae*, the poems by Statius and Martial on the imperial freedman Earinus, and the poems in Martial on the re-instatement of the *lex Iulia*[139]. I will begin with the first poem of the *Silvae*; by way of preparation I will briefly indicate the contents of the poem and the way it has been interpreted in conventional scholarship[140].

Silvae 1.1 is a description of a huge equestrian statue of Domitian in the Forum. The statue was probably vowed in connection with the double triumph over the Chatti and the Dacians in the autumn of 89 (cf. 6–7, 26–27, 51, 79–81), and dedicated not long afterwards, because Statius stresses the rapidity with which the work has been executed (61–65); this would bring the date of the poem, which was written within a day of the dedication (1.*ep*.17–20), to around the beginning of 90[141]. The statue shared in the general destruction of all images of Domitian after his death, so that its appearance has to be reconstructed from Statius' poem, supplemented by a coin, and by (uncertain) remnants of the base, the dimensions of which suggest that the statue was indeed a colossus, as Statius states in his first line[142]. In the rest of the introduction, the theme of size remains dominant, and Statius specifies that Domitian's mount surpasses both the Trojan horse (9–16) and the Thracian steed of the god Mars (18–21). Then the setting is described. The statue faces the temple of the

[139] Ahl's and Garthwaite's interpretations of these three groups of texts have also been discussed by Römer 1994: 100–13; although there is some common ground, my emphases and arguments are different from his.

[140] Cf. esp. Cancik 1965: 89–100, Hardie 1983: 131–32, 190–91, Geyssen 1996 (as well as the commentary by Vollmer and the notes by Frère).

[141] If a date in early 90 is correct, the execution of the *Vestalis maxima* Cornelia, alluded to at line 36, must have taken place before the triumph, as in the Armenian translation of Eusebius (p. 217 K.), rather than in 90–91, as in Jerome's version (p.191 H.^{2}), or the allusion must be to an earlier trial in 81–83 (D.C. 67.3.3; Eus. as above); cf. Gsell 1893: 80–81, Geyssen 1996: 31, n. 4, 112–13, n. 20. Moreover, 4.2.63–67 seems to imply that Statius had received no marks of favour from Domitian since March 90, which suggests that 1.1, 1.6, and 2.5 are all earlier than that date.

[142] On the destruction of Domitian's images after his death see Suet. *Dom*. 23.1, Plin. *Pan*. 52.4, D.C. 68.1.1. For the coin see *BMC* 2.406 (n. †). The base is probably not the large concrete rectangle with which it used to be identified, but must be located in an equally large rectangle slightly to the north; see Bergemann 1990: 164–66, C.F. Giuliani, "Equus: Domitianus", *LTUR* 2 (1995), 228–29, Darwall-Smith 1996: 227–33. Geyssen 1996: 24–27 wrongly denies that the statue was a colossus.

deified Julius, and this gives rise to a comparison of Caesar and Domitian, which stresses both analogy and difference: the analogy is that Caesar "by the gift of his adopted son has first shown our deified emperors the way to heaven" (23–24), which perhaps underwrites Domitian's adoption of his two great-nephews as his sons[143]. The difference is in mildness: Domitian deals more generously with foreign enemies, and at home would not have provoked Pompey and Cato to civil war (25–28). After further interpretation of the surroundings (29–31; cf. 33–36), a description of the statue itself is given, which moves (according to rhetorical precept) from the top downwards: first the rider is described (32–45), then the horse (46–55), and finally the base (58–60). The soil is said to groan under the enormous weight of the statue, but this is attributed to the emperor's divine *genius* (56–58); similarly, his divine presence is said to have accelerated the completion of the work, which was carried out with noisy enthusiasm (61–65). The din awakes "the guardian of the place" (66), Curtius, who once had plunged into the nearby *lacus Curtius* (subsequently named after him), and so saved Rome from defeat, and now re-emerges in order to hail Domitian as an even greater saviour of citizens (66–83). Then Statius takes another clue from the surroundings, comparing the much smaller equestrian statue of Caesar which stood in the nearby Forum Julium, and concluding that the difference between the two rulers is as great as that between their statues (84–90)[144]. Finally, Statius asserts the permanence of the statue (91–94), and imagines that Domitian's deified family members will use it as a nightly meeting-point (94–98). The poem concludes with wishes for a long life (99–107).

At first sight, this poem is comparable to other imperial poems on architectonic and artistic achievements, such as *Silvae* 4.2 (on the *domus Flauia*) and 4.3 (on the *via Domitiana*), even if here we have

[143] Thus Hardie 1983: 190–91, followed by Geyssen 1996: 72–75. It must be remarked, however, that this is somewhat speculative, because the adoption cannot be precisely dated, and is sometimes put as late as 95 (e.g. by Jones 1996: 123).

[144] Statius uses the word *regentes* (90). It is usually supposed that Caesar took his place as the first of the emperors only in Trajanic times (cf. e.g. Syme 1958: 1.432–34), but from this passage, as well as the earlier reference to the adoption of Octavian (23–24), it appears that this process was well underway by the time of Domitian; cf. Hardie 1983: 190–91. On the statue of Caesar cf. Richardson 1992: 144.

not a work *by* the emperor, but a work *for* the emperor, a gift from senate and people (99–100, 107). The "message" of the statue is conveyed both by its general characteristics (centrality, magnitude, splendour) and by iconographical details (captive Rhine under one of the hooves [51], the right hand which "forbids battles" [37], etc.)[145]. It cannot be said that Statius' poem immortalises the statue, because it is immortal itself; interestingly enough, this is described in language deriving from claims for the immortality of poetry, as made by Horace (*C.* 3.30) and Ovid (*Met.* 15.871–79). But the poem can be said to encode the message of the statue in another medium, adding further ideological articulation (as in the two comparisons with Julius Caesar). Moreover, being written from the standpoint not of the emperor, but of the subjects, it expresses their astonishment and admiration. Hence the questions, the exclamations, the comparisons, the exaggerations.

Yet it is precisely these features which lead Ahl to suspect that the praise is "too good to be true", and therefore cannot be meant as praise. In what follows I will not discuss all of his specific interpretations of the text, but focus on his treatment of exaggeration and comparison[146]. Ahl's major testimony for the former is Statius' description of the great weight of the statue:

> Vix sola sufficiunt insessaque pondere tanto
> subter anhelat humus; nec ferro aut aere, laborat
> sub genio (56–58)

> The soil almost gives way, and, with so heavy a weight lying upon it, the ground below is panting; not because of the iron or the bronze: it labours under his *genius*[147].

---

[145] The location in the middle of the Forum was unheard of (Bergemann 1990: 41–42), which in the Roman audience must have created a similar mixture of awe and resistance as the unheard-of seventeenth consulate, celebrated in *Silv.* 4.2. For an interpretation of the seting of the statue along these lines see Klodt 1998: 22–35.

[146] Detailed criticisms of Ahl's readings are to be found in Römer 1994: 102–04 and Geyssen 1996: *passim*.

[147] The notion of the weight of Domitian's *genius* would recur in *Silv.* 4.2.25–26 *(ille penates/ implet et ingenti genio iuuat)* if Coleman 1988: 91 were right in accepting Schwartz's emendation *grauat* for *iuuat*. But van Dam 1992: 200 rightly objects that this would imply that Domitian sat on the roof. He himself suggests

According to Ahl, this is so exaggerated as to become incredible; moreover, it would draw attention to the circumstance that "Domitian conducted a reign of terror which made the forum utter groans all too real"[148]. In refutation, it would not help to point out that in ancient thought the gods were characterised by supernatural weight, because Ahl is of course aware of this; he just believes that "Statius far surpasses the convention whereby gods are more weighty than men"[149]. When is panegyric exaggeration "too much"? One might quote Ovid in the *Fasti*, where "the earth subsided, pressed down by the weight of Jupiter" (3.330), but there no mention is made of panting. Yet perhaps the panting soil in Statius would not trigger the same associations in a Roman audience as it did in Ahl: at least, I have found no parallels in descriptions of tyranny for the metaphor of groaning under a heavy load. Moreover, the motif of the weight of the gods occurs twice more in the poem in contexts which are difficult to read as anything but serious. The horse of Mars, with which Domitian's is compared, proudly bears "the great weight" of the god (19–20), and Domitian's left hand carries a statuette of Minerva, which "does not weigh him down" (*non grauat*: 38): this is a subtle compliment for Domitian, who alone among mortals may bear the weight of the gods.

Not only exaggerations, also comparisons often give rise to divergent interpretations. This has to do with uncertainty about how far the *tertium comparationis*, the common ground of the comparison, extends. To take as an example the first comparison of Domitian with Julius Caesar, where the latter's deification is seen to prefigure the former's: does the similarity include the manner of death? In other words, does the circumstance that Caesar was murdered suggest (as Ahl holds) that a similar fate might be appropriate to Domitian[150]? Here it is important to realise that by adding elements to the

---

sacrat, but I think (with Courtney and Corti 1991b: 125–27) that *iuuat* should be kept.

[148] Ahl 1976: 30 (hence the quotation), 1984a: 96.

[149] Ahl 1976: 30, where he refers to the extensive collection of material in Cancik 1965: 93–96. The quotation is from Ahl 1984a: 96.The question is complicated by the occurrence of the motif in the proem to Lucan (1.56–58), which I have to leave out of account here.

[150] Ahl 1984a: 93.

comparison, it is *always* possible to produce irony. To take an example from another Domitianic poem: at the end of *Silvae* 4.3, the poet has the Sibyl formulate the wish that Domitian may live as long as Nestor, Tithonus, and herself (149–52). Now Tithonus, who had not received eternal youth, in the course of the years became increasingly decrepit, so that finally his wife (who did have eternal youth) had to lock him away. Statius of course knows that in this respect the analogy would not be complimentary, and (perhaps in order to forestall untoward interpretations) he has the Sibyl wish that Domitian may live as long as his mythological counterparts "in perpetual youth" (*perpetua ... iuuenta*: 149)[151]. One might of course argue that this disclaimer, by drawing attention to an ironic reading, suggests it[152], but this line of reasoning would leave the poet without any means of guarding against unintended interpretations. And sometimes Statius wishes that his patron may reach the number of years of Tithonus *without* wishing him eternal youth at the same time (*Silv.* 2.2.107, to Pollius Felix)[153]: in such cases the poet must have been able to trust his audience that it would not add extraneous elements to the *tertium comparationis*. To put this in more general terms: panegyric is only possible on the basis of a contract between the poet and his audience which defines the context of utterance as, precisely, panegyric. The words themselves cannot put an end to the attribution of meaning; only the situation in which the words are uttered can[154]. Of course this situation may itself be ambivalent and shifting, but not necessarily beyond the reach of historical research, which may attempt to describe in how far this was so.

A case in point is provided by the poems on Domitian's eunuch Earinus by both Martial (9.11–13, 16–17, 36) and Statius (*Silv.* 3.4).

---

151 Similarly *Silv.* 3.4.101–04, and for a non-imperial addressee 2.3.72–73 (Atedius Melior).

152 In this manner, Ahl 1984a: 92 reads Statius' *denial* that the comparison of Domitian's mount with the Trojan horse extends to the dire consequences of the latter (14–15) as an *affirmation* of "the fundamental ambiguity of the comparison between the statue and the Trojan horse".

153 Similarly 1.4.125–27 (Rutilius Gallicus) and 5.3.255–57 (Statius' father). An example from imperial panegyric: Sen. *Apoc.* 4.1.14.

154 For this point cf. (with reference to panegyric in Hellenistic poetry) Goldhill 1991: 272–83, esp. 279.

When Earinus, who was Domitian's favourite page, ceremonially marked the end of boyhood by having his hair cut, enclosed the clippings in a jewelled casket, and sent them, together with a mirror, to the temple of Aesculapius in his native Pergamum, both poets were requested to celebrate the occasion in verse[155]. Garthwaite, following the lead of Ahl, has found massive irony in their productions[156]. Again, I will not discuss the many detailed interpretations of individual passages, but focus on two more general issues.

About the first of these issue I can be brief. Garthwaite notes that Martial and Statius hint at the "homosexual" (or rather "pederastic") nature of the relationship between Domitian and his cupbearer: both poets stress Earinus' beauty, compare him with Ganymede, and Statius even uses the word *amor*)[157]. Now this is doubtlessly true, but Garthwaite's inference that it subverts the ostensible flattery seems to take insufficient account of Roman attitudes and practices. Domitian did indeed condemn some men under the *lex Scantinia* (Suet. *Dom.* 8.3), a law which seems to have punished sexual relations with freeborn Roman youths[158], but sexual relationships with slave-born or non-Roman youths were not penalised, nor did any *odium* attach

---

[155] Statius mentions an order (from Earinus himself, not Domitian) at *Silv.* 3.*ep.*16–20 (quoted p. 348). That Martial also received an order may be inferred, but is not certain; cf. Henriksén 1998–99: 1.92.

[156] Garthwaite 1984 (< 1978: 87–129) and 1993 (< 1978: 43–86), taking up suggestions in Ahl 1976: 29 and 1984b: 205–06. Innuendo in Martial is accepted by Holzberg 1988: 82–83, Pederzani 1995: 221, Grewing 1997: 79 (with reservations), and Obermayer 1998: 195–96, but denied by Sullivan 1991: 145 and Henriksén 1998–99: 1.18–19. Innuendo in Statius is accepted by Laguna 1992: 310, but denied by Verstraete 1989, Pederzani 1995: 217–84 (esp. 221), and Murison 1999: 211. Innuendo in both is accepted by B.W. Jones 1992: 31–32, but denied by Römer 1994: 105–06, 109, 112.

[157] Beauty: i.a. Mart. 9.16.1, 17.7–8; Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.26–59. Ganymede: Mart. 9.11.7, 16.5, 36; Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.12–20. *Amor*: *Silv.* 3.4.38: *Palatino famulus deberis amori* (where Courtney mentions Rothstein's conjecture *honori*). Laguna 1992: 310, 324–28 and Pederzani 1995: 262–67 analyse the erotic (and even matrimonial) overtones in the section where Statius describes Earinus' arrival at the court of Domitian (50–64).

[158] The precise provisions of this law are highly contested: see C.A. Williams 1999: 119–24, with references to the earlier literature. Williams plausibly suggests that the law originally covered *stuprum* with females as well as males, but that after the promulgation of the *lex Iulia*, which specifically dealt with females (see 44), its application may have been restricted to *stuprum* with males.

to them, as may be seen from Hadrian's deification of his beloved Antinous[159]. The possession of a handsome "Ganymede" was not perceived as sordid or contemptible, but as splendid and enviable[160]. Within such a context, the first cutting of the hair (which normally went together with the first shaving of the beard) is a gesture full of erotic resonance, because it marks the end of boyhood, and therewith of availability for pederastic relationships[161]. For Earinus, being a eunuch, the transition to manhood was not complete, and he had no beard to dedicate along with his hair (*Silv.* 3.4.78–82). Nevertheless, he no longer qualified as a cupbearer (Mart. 9.36). We cannot gauge what this meant in terms of his influence with Domitian, but perhaps his commission of celebratory poetry may be explained as final attempt to assert his standing.

More problematical, however, than the pederastic nature of the relationship, is the circumstance that Earinus was a eunuch, although Domitian himself had forbidden castration. The emperor's inconsistency must have been remarked on at the time; for it is likely that the historian Dio Cassius goes back to a contemporary source when he writes: "although he himself had a passion for a eunuch called Earinus (καίπερ ... αὐτὸς 'Εαρίνου τινὸς εὐνούχου ἐρῶν), yet he forbade that any person in the Roman empire should any longer be castrated" (67.2.3)[162]. Martial and Statius, too, seem to draw attention to the inconsistency, and Garthwaite has explained this from subversive intent. Because the two poets take very different approaches, it is best to discuss them separately.

---

[159] Cf. C.A. Williams 1999: 32–34 (34 on Domitian and Earinus), 56–59 (on comparisons with Jupiter and Ganymede), 60–61 (on Hadrian and Antinous). Hadrian was sometimes criticised for his behaviour (D.C. 69.11.4 [ἐσκώπτετο]; cf. SHA *Hadr.* 14.5), but this concerned the excessiveness of his reaction to Antinous' death rather than the attachment itself. Similarly, the adverse comment on Titus' *exoleti* and *spadones*, reported by Suetonius (*Tit.* 7.1) was motivated by their number (*greges*), as well as, presumably, by the ambiguity surrounding the sexual services provided by *exoleti* (Williams 83–86). The notoriously "good" emperor Trajan, who is commended by Dio because he ἐν ... τοῖς παιδικοῖς οὐδένα ἐλύπησεν (68.7.4), even had affairs with many freeborn boys, including Hadrian, if the *Historia Augusta* is to be believed (SHA *Hadr.* 2.7; cf. 4.5).

[160] Cf., on the *pueri* of Statius' non-imperial addressees, p. 304–305.

[161] See Obermayer 1998: 94–144, esp. 103–107.

[162] See D.C. 67.2.3 (quoted below).

Statius offers an elaborate apology, presenting Earinus' castration as a supernaturally painless operation performed by the god Aesculapius himself (65–72), and stressing that it had taken place earlier than Domitian's prohibition (73–82). Such an apology is in harmony with his normal manner: in the non-imperial *Silvae*, we have seen various examples (notably 1.2, 3.3, 4.5, 5.2) where Statius squarely confronted a controversial issue, and attempted to replace adverse rumours that were apparently circulating by his own, idealised, version of the truth[163]. In the case of the Earinus-poem, his effort has not been much appreciated by modern readers, but the repulsion they attest to is better explained by the ungratefulness of Statius' task than by any intention on his part to mobilise their feelings against Domitian[164].

Martial's strategy is more complex than that of Statius. He does not mention the castration explicitly, although he may hint at it when he has Ganymede complain that the first down is already hidden under his long hairs and Juno is already calling him a man (9.36.5–6). But earlier in Book 9, Martial twice praises Domitian for his castration edict (9.5 [6], 7 [8]), although that was by now several years old[165]. In both cases this is combined with praise for a prohibition of child prostitution, and it may be that the edict was repeated or extended on this occasion, and that for that reason it had a certain topicality around 94. It is also mentioned by Statius, in a poem from 95, as part of a catalogue of beneficial measures by Domitian (*Silv.* 4.3.13–15); because it is there flanked by the restoration of the Capitol in 82 (16) and the vine-edict of 91–92 (11–12), one cannot be confident that Statius included it because it was topical. But if not, his reason must has been that it formed an important part of the image Domitian wished to project of himself. So, either way, Martial had a perfectly valid legitimation for praising the edict in two poems

---

[163] See further esp. p. 307.

[164] Cf. Ahl 1984b: 206, who quotes Vessey's verdict "these verses [scil. those on the castration] ... have, unquestionably, an effect hardly less than emetic upon a modern reader" (1973: 35) only to argue that this effect is intended.

[165] The edict is dated to 81–82 by Eusebius-Jerome (p.190 H.^{2}), but Statius connects it with Domitian's activities as *censor* (*Silv.* 4.3.13–15), which would imply a *t.p.q.* of 85. In any case it is earlier than ca. 87, because it is alluded to at Mart. 2.60. See Henriksén 1998–99: 1.76–77.

at the beginning of Book Nine. Yet a suspicion remains that he used precisely this legitimation as a cover for drawing attention to Domitian's hypocrisy. But, as often, the dynamics of flattery make any inference about intention well-nigh impossible. Did Martial exhaust all the possibilities of flattery open to him, not caring too much if one piece of flattery did not square too well with another? Or did he deliberately draw attention to such contradictions? And, more importantly: what was he perceived as doing by his contemporaries?

The answer will have to take into account that, among the mass of panegyric material in Book 9, it is a group of poems involving the politics of sexuality which has been seen as the locus of resistance[166]. This is all the more relevant because the other group of poems in Martial where innuendo has been found concerns Domitian's renewal of Augustus' law against adultery, the *lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis*[167]. Domitian's measure has a prominent place in Book 6, from the very beginning onwards[168]. Immediately after the introductory dedication to Julius Martialis (6.1), he places an epigram which combines praise of the *lex Iulia* and of the castration edict, and ends in a forceful *pointe*:

> Nec spado iam nec moechus erit te praeside quisquam:
> at prius—o mores!—et spado moechus erat. (6.2.5–6)

> Under your rule no one will be either eunuch or adulterer. But formerly—alas for our morals!—even a eunuch was an adulterer.

After an epigram announcing the birth of a son of Domitian (which will be discussed below), the *lex Iulia* is again celebrated. Martial, addressing the emperor, lists a number of his benefactions, only to conclude:

> plus debet tibi Roma quod pudica est. (6.4.5)

> Rome owes you more because she is chaste.

But the subsequent poems on the *lex Iulia* do not quite bear out this claim. Three of them satirise women who marry only to legalise

---

[166] Garthwaite 1993 finds some subversive content elsewhere in Book 9, but far less than he did in 1978: 43–86, 147–67.

[167] For the law, see *RSt* 2.781–86 (and cf. further p. 298).

[168] A reference to the *lex Iulia* occurs already at 5.75, which suggests that the renewal is to be dated to late 89.

their adultery (6.7, 22, 45), and a fourth ironically congratulates a man to whom the law does not apply—because he practices oral sex (6.91)[169]. Moreover, there are a number of poems not making explicit reference to the *lex Iulia*, but mocking adulterous women and their dull-witted (or complaisant) husbands (6.6, 31, 39, 67, 90). Such poems, it has been proposed by Garthwaite and others, expose the *lex Iulia* as a sham[170]. Against this, it might be argued that mocking the transgressors of the law reinforces rather than undermines its validity, and that the satire is directed not at the emperor, but at such people as do not allow themselves to be ruled by him[171]. The same issue arises with respect to the poems in Book 5 on Domitian's renewal of the *lex Roscia*, which reserved the first fourteen rows of seats in the theatre to the equestrian order[172]. Here too, Martial mocks the transgressors of the law, and although here too, a critical message has been detected, one may well hold that Martial wrote to support rather than to subvert[173]. Moreover, criticism of usurpers of equestrian privilege allowed him to flaunt his own status as a *bona fide* Roman knight (cf. 5.13).

However, Martial's treatment in Book 6 is significantly different from that in Book 5. Without a necessity to do so, he sets up extravagant claims, which he goes on to refute in the sequel: Rome is far from "chaste" (as Martial himself spells out in 6.45), and even the outrage of eunuchs being adulterers (*o mores!*) has not disappeared:

---

[169] Mart. 6.22 is quoted at p. 299. On 6.91 see Grewing 1997: 572–74, who argues that the fictional addressee "Zoilus" is to be taken as a *fellator* (thus also Shackleton Bailey 1993: 2.71, n. *c*); however, because *the lex Iulia* covers relationships with women, he should rather be thought of as a *cunnilingus* (cf. 11.85, which clearly refers back to 6.91).

[170] Garthwaite 1990: 14–16 (< 1978: 25–29), accepted by Holzberg 1988: 81; but see already Szelest 1974: 111 (= 1986: 2574) and Hofmann 1983: 243–44.

[171] In this sense Römer 1994: 110, Grewing 1997: 33–35, 78, 86. Martial's focus on the husbands in a number of the poems (6.6, 31, 39, 67) is to be explained from the circumstance that a woman could only be prosecuted if her husband divorced her first; see Treggiari 1991: 285–89.

[172] The cycle comprises the following poems: 8, 14, 23, 25, 27, 35, 38, 41. On the *lex Roscia* see Rawson 1987 = 1991: 508–45 (113 = 543–44 on its renewal by Domitian; criticised by Howell 1995: 84–85).

[173] Garthwaite 1990: 13–14 (< 1978: 24) assumed criticism, but in Garthwaite 1998 the idea is silently abandoned.

"Marulla" would have several children from her slaves "Coresus" and "Dindymus", if these had not been castrated (6.39.20–21), and the reason why "Caelia" has so many eunuchs is obvious (if not to her husband): "Caelia wants to be fucked (*uult futui*) without giving birth" (6.67)[174]. With these juxtapositions, Martial does indeed seem to draw attention to the speciousness of his own panegyrical rhetoric. But it would be too simplistic too read this only as a (rather gratuitous) criticism of the ineffectivity of the law. More than an attempt to regulate the behaviour of the citizens, the law was a statement of ideology, proclaiming the return to a fictive past of moral rectitude; as in Augustus' time, the law was promulgated in close temporal proximity to the celebration of the *ludi saeculares* with their message of purification and renewal[175]. Martial's resistance may well be on this ideological plane. There was a certain tension between his identity as a poet of sexual explicitness and the identity of Domitian as a corrector of morals, a tension which is articulated in the very first poem Martial addresses to Domitian (1.4), and which informs his carefully-advertised decisions not to include obscene poems in books dedicated to the emperor (5.2, 8.*ep.*, 1)[176]. Poems on adultery belonged to his stock-in-trade, and the *lex Iulia* allowed him to cast them as satire on those who broke the law, rather than forego the theme altogether. But by doing so, he also affirmed that the law could not abolish the reality that provided the matter for his epigrams. However, his confidence seems to have been premature: in the following books published under Domitian (7–9), the increase in panegyric content, which shows that Martial became ever more closely involved with the court, is accompanied by a virtual absence

[174] For the explanation of these two passages see Grewing 1997: 285–87, 435–36.

[175] On the (Augustan) *lex Iulia* as "symbolic discourse" see Edwards 1993: 34–62. The Augustan law probably dates from 18 B.C.E., and was followed by the *ludi saeculares* in 17; conversely, the Domitianic renewal in 89 (see n. 168) was preceded by the *ludi saeculares* in 88.

[176] On Martial as a poet of sexual explicitness see e.g. Richlin 1992: 6–7, 9–12, Sullivan 1991: 64–74. on Domitian's *correctio morum* (Suet. *Dom.* 8.3) e.g. Grelle 1980. Holzberg 1988: 79–85 rightly notes that the criticism of Domitian that has been found in Martial is limited to questions of sexual morality, and should be distinguished from the more politically inspired *Prinzipatskritik* of some sections of the senatorial aristocracy.

of poems on adultery, which reappear only under Nerva and Trajan[177].

There is a further complication bearing upon the attitudes of Martial and his contemporaries. In the same way as Domitian's castration edict, his renewal of the *lex Iulia* was characterised as hypocritical: Dio Cassius writes that among the women punished for adultery were some who had been debauched by Domitian himself (67.12.1). Such comments must go back to contemporary stories (whether true or not), as we can see from a poem by Martial written within months of Domitian's assassination. There Martial ironically commiserates with an adulterous woman, who, after the accession of Nerva, no longer has the excuse of being summoned by Domitian to one of his villas (11.7.1–5). In itself, such rumours need not have done Domitian great harm: some glamour always attaches to the successful adulterer, and Augustus himself had been publicly teased with not living up to his own ideals[178]. But one specific affair that Domitian had allegedly had was more serious: that with his niece Julia, the daughter of Titus. According to the sources the affair began already when she was still married to her husband, and continued after the latter's execution; her death was said to be caused by an abortion forced upon her by Domitian[179]. The flagrant inconsistency with the *lex Iulia* was not lost upon Juvenal, writing a few years after Domitian's death:

> qualis erat nuper tragico pollutus adulter
> concubitu, qui tunc leges reuocabat amaras
> omnibus atque ipsis Veneri Martique timendas,
> cum tot abortiuis fecundam Iulia uuluam
> solueret et patruo similes effunderet offas. (Juv. 2.29–33)

---

[177] In Books 7–9 there is only 8.31 and (in the context of an attack on a stingy patron) 9.2. Under Nerva and Trajan: 10.52 (on a eunuch as adulterer; cf. Shackleton Bailey 1978: 286 = 1997: 81–82), 69, 95, 102; 11.7, 71; 12.58, 91, 93.

[178] D.C. 54.16.3 (χλευασμῷ ὅτι πολλαῖς γυναιξὶν ἐχρῆτο); cf. Suet. *Aug.* 69–71.1. On the ambivalence surrounding adultery see Edwards 1993: 47–49.

[179] For the sources on Julia see *PIR*[2] F 426, Raepsaet-Charlier 1987: 323–24. The story of the abortion is found in Plin. *Ep.* 4.11.6, Juv. 2.29–33, Suet. *Dom.*22; without reference to the abortion, the relationship with Domitian is described by D.C. 67.3.2 and alluded to by Plin. *Pan.* 52.3 and 63.7. The precise chronology is contested: see Murison 1999: 217–18, with references to earlier discussions.

> Such [scil. a hypocrite] was a while ago the adulterer polluted (30) by a union worthy of tragedy, who was calling back harsh laws, terrifying to everybody, even to Mars and Venus themselves, at the very time when Julia, by means of many abortives, loosened her fertile womb and poured out lumps resembling her uncle.

The relationship between Domitian and his niece was "a union worthy of tragedy" because it was not only adulterous, but also incestuous; moreover, it was in flagrant conflict with the renewal of "harsh laws" against adultery, i.e. the *lex Iulia*[180].

Against this background, it becomes highly significant that Martial attributes a prominent role to Julia in a poem which he put in third position in Book 6, in-between the second and fourth poems, both devoted to the renewal of the adultery law. In this poem, he announces, in tones borrowed from Virgil's fourth eclogue, the imminent birth of a son and successor to Domitian (in vain, because no child was ever born); Julia, who had been deified after her death, is cast in the role of the Parcae:

> Nascere Dardanio promissum nomen Iulo,
> uera deum suboles; nascere, magne puer,
> cui pater aeternas post saecula tradat habenas,
> quique regas orbem cum seniore senex.
> Ipsa tibi niueo trahet aurea pollice fila
> et totam Phrixi Iulia nebit ouem. (6.3)

> Be born, name promised to Dardanian Julus, true progeny of gods; be born, great boy, so that ages hence your father may hand you the eternal reins, and you may govern the world as an old man together with an older one. (5) Julia herself with snow-white thumb will draw golden threads for you, and spin Phrixus' entire sheep.

This is sophisticated panegyric: the recent celebration of the Saecular Games provides the inspiration for a link with Virgil's prophecy of new *saecula* brought about by the birth of a "boy"; the Virgilian motifs of golden age and the spinning Parcae have been fused into the idea that the Parcae spin golden threads, as many as would make

[180] The mention of Mars and Venus, the most famous adulterous couple of myth, may have been inspired by Mart. 6.21, where they eventually get married (in order to obey the law?); similarly, it seems, 6.13 (where they are inspired by Julia!). Cf. further p. 297, with n. 19.

up an entire Golden Fleece[181]. The birth of a lawful child is in accordance with Domitian's policy of moral renovation, and the role given to the recently deified Julia underlines the harmony within the imperial family[182]. This seems to be reinforced by the placement of the poem between the two celebrations of the *lex Iulia*, as well as by verbal echoes further tightening the connection[183]. But as soon as we recall the stories about Domitian and Julia, the poem becomes a mockery, and Garthwaite and others have read it as such[184].

Whether such a reading is correct or not, depends upon what knowledge was available to Martial and his audience. A first possibility is that the slanderous stories are inventions from the time of Trajan, concocted to serve the purpose of blackening Domitian's memory[185]. If this is true, Martial's text would be a perfectly innocuous composition. However, the hypothesis does not seem very probable: that the stories consist of standard invective against "tyrants" does not make them untrue, and even if they are untrue, they may well have originated in Domitian's life-time. A second possibility, therefore, is that the stories circulated already when Martial wrote his poem, but that he was not aware of them; this cannot be excluded, but does not seem particularly likely, and must be untrue if Suetonius (*Dom.* 22) and Dio Cassius (67.3.2) are right in stating that the emperor had loved his niece "openly"[186]. So we are left with a third possibility, that the stories (whether true or false) were circu-

---

181 The links with Virgil are analysed by Grewing 1997: 84–92. The fusion of the motifs of the Golden Age and the spinning Parcae is anticipated in Sen. *Apoc.* 4.1.8–12 and Calp. *Ecl.* 4.139–40 (cf. p. 83, n. 161 on the date), but without the conceit of the Golden Fleece.

182 Cf. the motif of *Concordia Augusta* in the coinage, combined with representations of Julia (*BMC* 2.350 [n. *]), as well as Domitia (*ibid.* [no. 249]).

183 The first word of the poem, *nascere*, takes up *nasci* in the preceding poem (6.2.4) and *renata* in the following one (6.4.3); the pattern is continued in the next poem on the law, where the *lex Iulia* itself is said to be *renata* (6.7.1). Moreover, *Iulia* (6) is inevitably recalled by *Iulia lex* (6.7.1).

184 Garthwaite 1990: 16–22 (< 1978: 29–43), accepted by Holzberg 1988: 82, but rejected by Römer 1994: 109–10 and Grewing 1997: 84–92.

185 This is argued by Vinson 1981: 431–38, accepted by Jones 1992: 38–40 (and 1996: 51) and Grewing 1997: 84-86; but Murison 1999: 217–18 is more cautious.

186 Suet. *Dom.* 22: *palam*; D.C. 67.3.2: ἀπαρακαλυπτότερον (Xiph.), ἀπαρακαλύπτως (Zon.).

lating *and* that Martial was aware of them. Yet even so, we cannot be sure he intended to be subversive. He may also have felt the need for a straight face, callously underwriting the official version, even though he knew it was false[187]. If a regime is built on lies, it may be a necessary policy for those supporting the regime to affirm and even increase those lies. Perhaps it is instructive to compare Seneca's behaviour after Nero murdered Agrippina: he wrote a letter to the Senate in which he pretended that Agrippina had wanted to murder Nero, and then had committed suicide after the failure of her attempt. Tacitus leaves no doubt that this was so absurd as to be completely incredible, and that Seneca "was the subject of adverse rumour, because with such a text he had written a confession" (*Ann.* 14.11.3). Although Seneca in his letter exposed Nero as an assassin, his contemporaries apparently did not think that it had been his intention to do so: he was not praised for his courage, but criticised, apparently for his conformism[188]. In the case of Martial, we have no information about audience response, apart from the fact that the most powerful member of his audience, the emperor, did not withdraw his favour. And perhaps we should see the absence of adultery poems in the following Domitianic books as an indication that these poems had led to some raised eyebrows in high places, an effect that Martial, even if he intended it, may have had no wish to repeat. His flattery may not have been sincere at the level of contents, but he could not afford too much insincerity at the level of the speech act, if he wished to remain successful, or even safe, as a court poet.

Martial, unlike Statius, survived Domitian, and three of his books were published under Nerva and Trajan, so that his utterances about Domitian after the latter's death can be compared to his earlier panegyric. At the beginning of this chapter, a poem has already been

---

[187] Other evidence for the official version (whether that was hypocritical or not) includes (a) the coin-type with Julia on the obverse and a peacock (symbol of matrimonial harmony) with the legend *Concordia Augusti* on the reverse (*BMC* 2.350; cf. ibid. a similar coin with Domitia on the obverse); (b) statues of Julia in the guise of Venus (cf. Hausmann in Daltrop, Hausmann, and Wegner 1966: 52, 58; Micocki 1995: 52, 190–91), such as the one celebrated by Martial at 6.13; and (c) the circumstance that the ashes of the deified Julia in the *Templum Gentis Flauiae* were honoured by the Roman matrons (Mart. 9.1.6–7).

[188] Bartsch 1994: 20–22, 25–26, discusses the varied role-playing after Agrippina's death (but without considering Seneca).

quoted in which he retrospectively defined his use of formulas such as "lord and god" as "flatteries" (*blanditiae*) (10.72)[189]. It would certainly be mistaken to conclude from such recantations that Martial had always at heart resented the praise he had uttered: such recantations are—in the terminology of J.C. Scott—not simply the "hidden transcript" now finally emerging into the light, but already part of another "public transcript" that made criticism of Domitian obligatory[190]. But it would equally be mistaken to assume that Martial (or Pliny or Tacitus or any other author who vented his pent-up frustrations after Domitian's death) was merely a cynical turn-coat.

If we look at the opening sequence of the first book Martial published under the new regime, we find that it contains, on the one hand, poems in celebration of the emperor and closely mirroring the official ideology: Nerva is hailed as a new Augustus (11.3), he receives good wishes for his third consulship, in conjunction with the senate (11.4), he is compared to Numa, and his republican spirit is asserted (11.5); not only this manner of beginning a book, but also the language of praise is inevitably close to Martial's practice under Domitian[191]. But on the other hand the initial sequence also includes poems asserting the Saturnalian character of the book (11.2, 6) and expressing Martial's relief that he may now finally write a book that he can call "mine" (11.2.8). Nerva, whom Martial not so long ago had praised a writer of frivolous verse (8.70, 9.26), was not one to restrict festive licence:

> Clamant ecce mei "io Saturnalia" uersus:
> et licet et sub te praeside, Nerua, libet. (11.2.6–7)

> Look! My verses shout "Io Saturnalia". It is permissible, and under your rule, Nerva, it is also pleasurable.

Immediately after the introductory sequence, Martial re-introduces the adultery theme with a grim jest at Domitian's own practices

---

[189] See p. 382.

[190] The concepts of "hidden" and "public transcript", deployed to good effect by Bartsch 1994, derive from the illuminating study of the effects of power on communication by J.C. Scott 1990.

[191] On beginning the book with the emperor see pp. 376–377. For echoes of earlier language of praise cf. e.g. the prayer to Janus in 11.4.5–8 with 8.2, and the hypothetic reaction of Republican heroes in 11.5.5–14 with Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.27–28.

(11.7). Somewhat later in the book, there comes a truly Saturnalian moment, when Martial begins a highly obscene piece by comparing the width of a certain woman's vagina to "the arse of a bronze horseman" (*equitis culus aeni*: 11.21.1). This must refer to the massive equestrian statue celebrated by Statius, which, like all statues of Domitian, was demolished immediately after his death. When the rider was taken off his horse, a large hole must have been revealed in the place where his buttocks should have been (as happened when the similar statue of Marcus Aurelius was dismantled for conservation)[192]. This, if anything, was a reduction of the "high" and serious to the "low" and ridiculous.

But although Martial put the Saturnalian spirit of the book under the auspices of Nerva, and although he had earlier offered poetry to Nerva (9.26), he did not dedicate the book to him, but to an imperial freedman, Parthenius (11.1). Parthenius, who was *a cubiculo* ("chief chamberlain"), had already been an important "broker" for Martial under Domitian, and apparently remained so under Nerva[193]. However, because Parthenius had been involved in the plot to assassinate Domitian, his head was demanded by the praetorians, and Nerva was finally forced to comply[194]. This happened in the course of 97, but before then, Martial had once more used Parthenius to offer a book to Nerva. This was an anthology from Books 10 (first edition) and 11, of which the presentation poems have been included, apparently posthumously, in Book 12[195]. One of these addresses Nerva in rather serious tones:

---

[192] This interpretation was proposed by Rodríguez-Almeida 1982–83: 95–98. It was ignored by Kay 1985 and Shackleton Bailey 1993, but reported, and accepted, by Darwall-Smith 1996: 230.

[193] For the earlier relationship between Martial and Parthenius see 345–346.

[194] See D.C. 68.3.3, *Epit. Caes.* 12.7–8, and cf. Aur. Vict. 11.9, Suet. *Dom.* 23.1, Plin. *Pan.* 6.1–2.

[195] These poems are 12.11, to Parthenius, and 12.4 (5) and 5 (2 + 6.1–6), both to Nerva. They are not included in the manuscript family γ, and 11 interrupts the alternation of elegiac distichs with other metres to be observed from 8 onwards, as do 15, 28 (29), 29 (26), and 36, all likewise omitted in γ. The most likely explanation is that these epigrams have been added by another hand; see Lehmann 1931: 48–52 and Merli 1993: 253–54.

Quae modo litoreos ibatis carmina Pyrgos,
  ite sacra, iam non pulueruenta, uia.
Contigit Ausoniae procerum mitissimus aulae
  Nerva: licet tuto nunc Helicone frui:
recta Fides, hilaris Clementia, cauta Potestas
  iam redeunt; longi terga dedere Metus.
Hoc populi gentesque tuae, pia Roma, precantur:
  dux tibi sit semper talis, et iste diu. (12.5 [2 + 6.1–6])

Poems that used to go to coastal Pyrgi, go, no longer dusty, by the via Sacra. The Italian court has fallen to the mildest of aristocrats, Nerva. Now you may enjoy the Helicon in safety: (5) upright Trust, cheerful Clemency, careful Power now return: long-lasting Fears have taken flight. This is the prayer of your peoples and nations, loyal Rome: may you always have such a leader, and this one for a long time.

From the first distich we learn that Nerva had a villa at or near Pyrgi (Santa Severa) on the Tyrrhenian coast, where he had often stayed in the years before his accession, in accordance with his "quiet" life-style[196]. Martial was wont to send his books of epigrams thither (cf. 9.26), but now they need no longer gather the dust of a long journey, because they may go by the via Sacra to the imperial palace on the Palatine[197]. Nerva's rule has brought safety to the Muses[198]: formerly, they, too, had had been terrorised by "Fears". This seems to go fur-

[196] It is usually thought that Pyrgi is here mentioned as a port, from which the epigrams were either on their way *to* Spain (Immisch 1911: 505–06) or *from* Spain (Shackleton Bailey 1993: 3.96, n.*a*; impossible on chronological grounds: cf. Howell 1998: 180–81). But although Pyrgi is still mentioned as a port by Strabo (5.2.8), Pliny's statement that the coast around Centumcellae was *per longum spatium ... importuosum* (*Ep.* 6.31.17) implies that it had ceased to function as such. But Pliny's mother-in-law owned a villa at Alsium (Palo) (*Ep.* 6.10.1), as later did Marcus Aurelius (Fro. *Fer. Als.*), and Trajan had (or built) a villa at Centumcellae (Civitavecchia), later likewise in the possession of Marcus Aurelius (Fro. *M. Caes.* 3.21.1, 3 [51.19, 25 v.d.H.^{2}] and 5.74.1 [85.7 v.d.H.^{2}]). For archaeological remains of these and other maritime villas in the neighbourhood see Torelli 1980: 92–117. For Nerva's *quies* see p. 308. The idea that *litoreos ... Pyrgos* meant a villa was apparently also suggested by Caerols 1995: 103 (cf. Howell 1998: 180–81, n. 25), but I could not procure the book.

[197] For books becoming *pulueruentus* by a long journey cf. 3.5.8.

[198] The reading *tuto* (4) is an emendation by Friedländer (for *toto*), inspired by a line in the preceding poem: *plura legant uacui, quibus otia tuta dedisti* (12.4 [5].3). Even if the correction should not be accepted, the motif of security is in any case present in *Metus*.

ther than is required by the official rhetoric, and may reveal something of a reality that could not surface when Domitian was still alive[199].

Yet, the liberty of speech that was so enthusiastically greeted by Pliny and Tacitus as well as by Martial turned out not to exceed the liberty to vilify Domitian[200]. And the praises of Trajan in Pliny's *Panegyric* are hardly less extravagant, even though they may be more sincere, than Martial's epigrams in honour of Domitian. Martial himself included less imperial poems in Books 10 through 12 than in the preceding books, but it should be noted that Book 11 appeared within three months of Nerva's accession, whereas in Books 10 and 12 Martial was handicapped by not having a relationship of personal patronage to Trajan, who, unlike his predecessor was not a literary man and does not appear among Martial's addressees in the earlier books. Moreover, when Nerva died in the beginning of 98, Trajan stayed with the army on the Rhine, then went to the Danube and returned to Rome only in the course of 99, when Martial had already left for Spain. Under these circumstances, there could be no personal contact between Martial and Trajan. Nevertheless, both Book 10 and Book 12 contain a few poems in honour of the new emperor (10.6–7, 34, 72; 12.8–9). These can hardly be explained as attempts to initiate a relationship of personal patronage (especially in the case of the poems in Book 12, which was published from Spain), and are better seen as an acknowledgement that even without personal patronage, a subject had to honour the emperor. Pliny states that Trajan banned panegyric from the stage and that he no longer required that any speech in the senate began and ended with his praises (Plin. *Pan.* 54.1–4), but Martial apparently still felt that at the beginning of a book of verse, the poet should pay his respects.

---

[199] But 7.34 may suggest the atmosphere: when Martial says that nothing is better than the Baths of Nero, he imagines that someone *de malignis* (6) is immediately to hand to reproach him for preferring these to *domini deique nostri* ... *muneribus* (8–9). But Martial manages to turn it into a joke.

[200] Cf. e.g. Tac. *Agr.* 3.1, *Hist.* 1.1.4, Plin. *Pan.* 2.5, 55.2, 66.4–5. At *Pan.* 53 Plin. stresses the freedom to criticise the emperor's predescessors, suggesting that under Domtian it had been unsafe to criticise Nero (which was not true: cf. e.g. Mart. 7.21, 7.34, Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.58, 100–04, 118–19, 5.2.32).

APPENDIX

THE DATING OF MARTIAL'S *EPIGRAMS* AND STATIUS' *SILVAE*

Martial's Epigrams

Recent research has partly corrected the datings provided by L. Friedländer 1886: 1.50–67 (and in his wake by G. Wissowa in L. Friedländer 1919–23: 4.290–96). The best discussions are now by Citroni: 1975: ix–xxi on Books 1 and 2, 1988: 11–12 on the *Xenia* and *Apophoreta*, and 1989: 214–25 on the other books. I here give a summary of the publication dates for each book, accepting Citroni's arguments unless otherwise noted.

Spect.:	80.
13:	the *Xenia*, at the Saturnalia (i.e. in December) of 83 or 84[1].
14:	the *Apophoreta*, at the Saturnalia of 84 or 85, one year after the *Xenia*.
1:	around 85–86[2]; 1.1, 1.2, and probably 1.*ep.*, but hardly anything else, belong to a second edition in codex form, published not much earlier than 95 (cf. Citroni 1975: xix–xxi, 3–22)[3].

[1] The *terminus post quem* is Domitian's assumption of the title *Germanicus* (13.4), which fell in the second half of 83; see A. Martin 1987a, 1987b: 7–10, and 1988, correcting Buttrey 1980: 52–56. The arguments of Pitcher 1985 (and others) for a later date were rightly rejected by Citroni 1988: 11, n. 13 = 1996: 19–20, n. 14 and Leary 1996: 9-13.

[2] The *termini post quem* are Domitian's assumption of the censorship (1.4.7), which fell in 85, probably in April (see Buttrey 1975), and his first expedition against the Dacians (1.22.6), which Citroni (1975: x–xiii) dates to the winter of 85–86; because many scholars date it to 85 (e.g. Syme 1936: 168–70, Halfmann 1986: 182–83, Strobel 1989: 35–51, B.W. Jones 1992: 138–39), it is more prudent to leave the *t.p.q.* at 85.

[3] The *t.p.q* is the construction of the Forum Transitorium, mentioned by Martial at 1.2.8. In the archaeological literature (e.g. von Blanckenhagen 1940: 11, D'Ambra

2: soon after Book 1.
3: before mid-88 (Citroni 1987 attempts to date more precisely to autumn 87.
4: at the Saturnalia of 88 (cf. p. 110).
5: at the Saturnalia of 89 (cf. also Canobbio 1993)
6: between Books 5 and 7, perhaps at the Saturnalia of 90 or 91[4].
7: at the Saturnalia of 92.
8: at the Saturnalia of 93, rather than early in 94; see p. 130 with n. 128.
9: after May 94, probably at the end of 94 or the beginning of 95.
10: a first edition appeared at the Saturnalia of 95, a second in 98; the edition we have is the second, which retained many poems from the first (cf. 10.2).
11: at the Saturnalia of 96. An anthology from Books 10 and 11 was offered to Nerva (12.4 [5]), before the death of Parthenius, if 12.11 belonged to it (cf. p. 438 with n. 195).
12: at the Saturnalia of 101 (cf. p. 115).

The individual poems will normally have been written between the publication date of the book in which they occur and the publication date of the proceeding book. Thus, to limit myself to books which contain poems parallel to compositions in Statius' *Silvae*, Book 6 contains poems from 90 or from both 90 and 91, Book 7 poems from 92 or from both 91 and 92, Book 8 poems from 93, Book 9 poems roughly from 94, but perhaps also from the beginning of 95.

1993: 4; cf. Darwall-Smith 1996: 121, n. 54), this is sometimes dated to 85–86, but that dating is based on the passage of Martial, in ignorance of the second edition. Instead, the dating of the passage of Martial, and thus of the second edition, should be based on the dating of the forum, which is not elsewhere mentioned before 95 (Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.14–15); cf. Mart. 10.28.6 (from 97; see p. 354, n. 102) and 10.51.12 (from 95 or 96; see p. 68 with n. 98).

[4] Perhaps rather 91: illness (6.43, 47, 58, 70, 86) may have been the cause for skipping a year.

Statius' Silvae

The best surveys are Frère 1961: 1.xiii–xxv (table at xxii–xxv), and (for Book 4 only) Coleman 1988: xx–xxii. I accept their arguments unless otherwise noted, but silently revise the dates based on Martial in the light of the chronology given above. I first list the dates of composition of the poems, then the dates of publication of the books.

1.1: probably shortly after the end of 89[5].
1.2: contemporaneous with Mart. 6.21; if my interpretation is correct (see pp. 298–300), shortly after the renewal of the *lex Julia* (see p. 298 with n. 22 for the date); therefore probably from early 90.
1.3: undatable.
1.4: after the end of 89 and before the beginning of 92.
1.5: contemporaneous with Mart. 6.42, therefore from 90 or 91.
1.6: on a December 1st, perhaps in 89
2.1: contemporaneous with Mart. 6.28–29, therefore from 90 or 91.
2.2: autumn 90[6].
2.3: undatable, but perhaps roughly contemporaneous with Mart. 8.38; if so, from 93.
2.4: undatable (but probably later than 2.1).
2.5: undatable, but probably earlier than March 90[7] (cf. n. 5)
2.6: undatable.
2.7: in October; contemporaneous with Mart. 7 (cf. 7.21–23), therefore 92 or perhaps 91.
3.1: summer 91.
3.2: before the completion of the *Thebaid*, therefore from 90–91; cf. p. 196 with n. 8.

---

[5] See p. 422, n. 141.

[6] Not August, because the shadow described at 48–49 does not fall before mid-October (Krüger 1998: 189–90, 260–63).

[7] Perhaps 4.2.63–67 may be taken to imply that Statius had not been in touch with Domitian since March 90; if so, not only 1.1 and 1.6, but also 2.5 would be earlier than that date.

3.3: roughly contemporaneous with Mart. 7.40, but after Domitian had refused a triumph over the Sarmatians; therefore from January 93.

3.4: contemporaneous with Mart. 9.11–13, 16–17, 36, therefore from 94.

3.5: probably the last written poem in the book, but earlier than the poems in Book 4; therefore from later in 94 than 3.4.

4.1: January 95.

4.2: probably early in 95, but perhaps late in 94.

4.3: (early) summer 95.

4.4: summer 95; contemporaneous with the publication of the book.

4.5: in spring, probably 95, in view of the dates of the other poems in the book.

4.6: in winter, contemporaneous with Mart. 9.43–44, therefore 94–95.

4.7: 95; cf. p. 204.

4.8: summer 92 at the earliest.

4.9: at the Saturnalia of 94.

5.1: not earlier than around 94, but some time before the death of Domitian in September 96; cf. p. 301.

5.2: 95 or the first half of 96 (cf. p. 204 with n. 39).

5.3: from the end of 79 or the beginning of 80, with additions from 90 or 91: see pp. 195–198

5.4: undatable.

5.5: 95 or the first half of 96 (cf. p. 204).

On the publication dates of the books the following can be said (for Books 1–3 cf. p.285–289):

1: after the beginning of 92, probably in 92 itself.

2: probably in 93.

3: summer or autumn 94.

4: summer 95.

5: published posthumously before September 96; cf. p. 193.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, Wolfgang (1988) *Poetische und kritische Wälder. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und* Formen *des Schreibens "bei Gelegenheit"*, Heidelberg.

Ahl, Frederick M. (1976) *Lucan. An introduction*, Ithaca and London.

——(1984a) "The rider and the horse: politics and power in Roman poetry from Horace to Statius", *ANRW* 2.32.1, 40–110.

——(1984b) "The art of safe criticism in Greece and Rome", *AJPh* 105, 174–208.

Albert, Winfried (1988) *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike. Geschichte und Typologie von den Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit*, Frankfurt am Main.

Alföldi, Andreas (1970) *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt (reprinting two articles from 1934 and 1935).

Alföldy, Géza (1969) *Fasti Hispanienses. Senatorische Reichsbeamte und Offiziere in den Spanischen Provinzen des römischen Reiches von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Wiesbaden

——(1984) *Römische Sozialgeschichte*, 3rd edition (1st edition 1975), Wiesbaden.

——(1999) *Städte, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina. Epigraphisch-historische Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart.

Allen, jr., Walter (1938) "On the friendship of Lucretius with Memmius", *CPh* 33, 167–81.

——(1972) "Ovid's *cantare* and Cicero's *cantores Euphorionis*", *TAPhA* 103, 1–14.

Allen, jr., Walter, and Phillip H. DeLacy (1939) "The patrons of Philodemus", *CPh* 34, 59–65.

Allen, jr., Walter, a. o. (1969–70), "Martial: knight, publisher, and poet", *CJ* 65, 345–57.

Anderson, R. D., P. J. Parsons, and R. G. M. Nisbet (1979) "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm", *JRS* 69, 125–55.

André, Jean-Marie (1966) *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine*, Paris.

Argetsinger, Kathryn (1992) "Birthday rituals: friends and patrons in Roman poetry and cult", *ClAnt* 11, 175–93.

Aricò, Giuseppe (1965) "Stazio e Arrunzio Stella", *Aevum* 39, 345–47.

——(1980) "Introduzione", in: A. Traglia and id., *Opere di Publio Papinio Stazio*, Turin, 15–52.

Armstrong, David (1986) "Stylistics and the date of Calpurnius Siculus", *Philologus* 130, 113–36.

Assa, Janine (1964) "Aulus Bucius Lappius Maximus", in: *Akte des IV. internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik*, Vienna, 31–39.

Badian, Ernst (1985) "*Nobiles amici*: art and literature in an aristocratic society" (review article over Gold [ed.] 1982), *CPh* 80, 341–57.

Bailey, D. R. Shackleton (1978) "Corrections and explanations of Martial", *CPh* 73, 273–96 = *Selected Classical Papers*, Ann Arbor 1977, 65–94.

——(1980) "Martial 2.91 and 10.20", *CPh* 75, 69–70.

——(1989) "More corrections and explanations of Martial", *AJPh* 110, 131–50.

——(1990) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammata*, Stuttgart.

——(1993) *Martial. Epigrams*, Cambridge, Mass., and London (3 vols.).

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich (1984a) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (ed. and tr. C. Emerson) Minneapolis and Manchester.

——(1984b) *Rabelais and His World* (tr. H. Iswolsky; 2nd edition), Bloomington.

Balland, André (1981) *Fouilles de Xanthos*, vol. 7: *Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létôon*, Paris.

——(1998) "Quelques relations aristocratiques de Martial", *RÉA* 100, 43–63.

Balogh, Josef (1927) "'Voces paginarum'. Beiträge zur Geschichte des lauten Lesens und Schreibens", *Philologus* 82, 84–109, 202–40.

Bardon, Henry (1940) *Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien*, Paris.

——(1956) *La littérature latine inconnue*, vol. 2: *L'époque impériale*, Paris.

Barner, Wilfried (1973) *Produktive Rezeption. Lessing und die Tragödien Senecas*, Munich.

——(1985) "Vergnügen, Erkenntnis, Kritik. Zum Epigramm und seiner Tradition in der Neuzeit", *Gymnasium* 92, 350–71.

Barnes, Timothy D. (1967) "The family and career of Septimius Severus", *Historia* 16, 87–107.

——(1976) "The horoscope of Licinius Sura?", *Phoenix* 30, 76–79.

Bartman, Elizabeth (1992) *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature*, Leiden, New York and London.

Barton, Carlin A. (1993) *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The gladiator and the monster*, Princeton.

Bartsch, Shadi (1994) *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.

——(1997) *Ideology in Cold Blood. A reading of Lucan's Civil War*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.

Barwick, Karl (1932) "Zur Kompositionstechnik und Erklärung Martials", *Philologus* 87, 19–28.

——(1958) "Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleineren Gedichten Catulls", *Philologus* 102, 284–318.

——(1959) *Martial und die zeitgenössische Rhetorik*, Berlin.

Baudy, Dorothea (1987) "Strenarum commercium. Über Geschenke und Glückwünsche zum römischen Neujahrsfest", *RhM* 130, 1–28.

Bauman, Richard A. (1974) *Impietas in principem. A study of treason against the Roman emperor with special reference to the first century A.D.*, Munich.

Beard, Mary, John North, and Simon Price (1998) *Religions of Rome*, vol.1: *A History*, Cambridge.

Bell, jr., Albert A. (1984), "Martial's daughter?", *CW* 78, 21–24.

——(1985) "A new approach to the *Laus Pisonis*", *Latomus* 44, 871–78.

Beloch, Julius (1890) *Campanien. Geschichte und Topographie des antiken Neapel und seiner Umgebung*, 2nd edition, Breslau.

Benker, Margit (1987) *Achill und Domitian. Herrscherkritik in der "Achilleis" des Statius*, diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg.

Bérard, François (1984) "La carrière de Plotius Grypus et le ravitaillement de l'armée impériale en campagne", *MEFRA* 96, 259–324.

Bergemann, Johannes (1990) *Römische Reiterstatuen. Ehrendenkmäler im öffentlichen* Bereich, Mayence.

Bergmann, Bettina, and Christine Kondoleon (eds.) (1999) *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, New Haven and London.

Bergmann, Marianne (1998) *Die Strahlen der Herrscher. Theomorphes Herrscherbild und politische Symbolik im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mayence.

Best, jr., Edward E. (1968–69) "Martial's readers in the Roman world", *CJ* 64, 208–12.

Bickel, E. (1917–18) "Beiträge zur römischen Religionsgeschichte. II. Zum Cybelekult (Statius *silv.* V 3, 176ff.)", *RhM* 72, 52–61.

Binder, Gerhard (1995) "Öffentliche Autorenlesungen. Zur Kommunikation zwischen römischen Autoren und ihrem Publikum", in: id. and K. Ehrlich (eds.), *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort*, Trier, 265–332.

Billerbeck, Margarethe (1986) "The tree of Atedius Melior (Statius, *Siluae* II, 3)", in: C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 4, Brussels, 528–36.

Birley, Anthony R. (1981) *The Fasti of Roman Britain*, Oxford.

——(1988) *The African Emperor. Septimius Severus*, 2nd edition of *Septimius Severus. The African emperor* (1972), London.

——(1992) *Locus virtutibus patefactus? Zum Beförderungssystem in der Hohen Kaiserzeit*, Opladen.

——(2000) *Onomasticon to the Younger Pliny. Letters and Panegyric*, München and Leipzig.

Birt, Theodor (1882) *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältnis zur Literatur*, Berlin.

——(1907) *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst. Archäologisch-antiquarische Untersuchungen zum antiken Buchwesen*, Leipzig.

——(1913) *Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriß des antiken Buchwesens*, Munich.

Blanck, Horst (1992) *Das Buch in der Antike*, Munich.

Blanckenhagen, Peter-Heinrich von (1940) *Flavische Architektur und ihre Dekoration untersucht am Nervaforum*, Berlin.

Blok, Anton (1969) "Variations in patronage", *Sociologische Gids* 16, 365–78.

Blümner, Hugo (1911) *Die römischen Privataltertümer*, Munich.

Boissevain, Jeremy (1966) "Patronage in Sicily", *Man* 1, 18–33.

——(1969) "Patrons as brokers", *Sociologische Gids* 16, 379–86.

——(1974) *Friends of Friends. Networks, manipulators and coalitions*, Oxford.

Bollinger, Traugott (1969) *Theatralis licentia. Die Publikumsdemonstrationen an den öffentlichen Spielen in Rom der früheren Kaiserzeit und ihre Bedeutung im politischen Leben*, Winterthur.

Bonner, Stanley F. (1977) *Education in Ancient Rome. From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, London.

Boulvert, Gérard (1970) *Esclaves et affranchis impériaux sous le Haut-Empire romain: rôle politique et administratif*, Naples.

——(1974) *Domestique et fonctionnaire sous le Haut-Empire romain: la condition de l'affranchi et de l'esclave du prince*, Naples.

Bourne, J. M. (1986) *Patronage and Society in Nineteenth-Century England*, London.

Bowersock, Glen W. (1994) *Fiction as History. Nero to Julian*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

Boyancé, Pierre (1964) "La science d'un quindécemvir au 1er siècle après J.-C.", *REL* 42, 334–46.

Braund, S. H. (1988) *Beyond Anger. A study of Juvenal's third book of Satires*, Cambridge.

——(Susanna Morton) (1996a) *Juvenal. Satires Book I*, Cambridge.

——(1996b) "The solitary feast: a contradiction in terms?", *BICS* 41, 37–52.

Braunert, Horst (1964) "Das Athenaeum zu Rom bei den Scriptores Historiae Augustae", in: J. Straub (ed.) *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium Bonn 1963*, Bonn, 9–41.

Bremer, Jan Maarten (1991) "Poets and their patrons", in: H. Hofmann and A. Harder (eds.) *Fragmenta Dramatica. Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (*Festschrift* for S. L. Radt), Göttingen, 39–60.

Bremmer, Jan N. (1998) "The novel and the Apocryphal Acts: place, time and readership", in: H. Hofmann and M. Zimmerman (eds.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9, Groningen, 157–80.

Bright, David F. (1980) *Elaborate Disarray: The nature of Statius' Silvae*, Meisenheim am Glan.

Brink, Charles Oscar (1982) *Horace on Poetry*, vol. 3: *Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*, Cambridge.

Brunt, Peter A. (1965) "'Amicitia' in the Late Roman Republic", *PCPhS* 2, 1–20.

——(1979) "Divine elements in the imperial office" (review article over Fears 1977) *JRS* 69, 168–75.

——(1988) *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford.

Bruun, Christer, "The name and possessions of Nero's freedman Phaon", *Arctos* 23, 41–53.

Bücheler, Franz (1882) "Coniectanea", *RhM* 37, 321–42 = *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2, Leipzig and Berlin 1927, 444–63.

Buchheit, Vinzenz (1960) "Statius' Geburtstagsgedicht zu Ehren Lucans (Silv. 2,7)", *Hermes* 88, 231–49.

——(1961) "Martial's Beitrag zum Geburtstag Lucans als Zyklus", *Philologus* 105, 90–96.

——(1977) "Catull, Virgil, Martial und Stella in Plinius Epist. 9,25", *SO* 52, 83–87.

Bumke, Joachim (1979) *Mäzene im Mittelalter. Die Gönner und Auftraggeber der höfischen Literatur in Deutschland 1150–1300*, Munich.

Buresch, K. (1894) "Die griechischen Trostbeschlüsse", *RhM* 49, 424–60.

Burgess, Theodore C. (1902) *Epideictic Literature*, Chicago.

Burnikel, Walter (1980) *Untersuchungen zur Struktur des Witzepigramms bei Lukillios und Martial*, Wiesbaden.

——(1990) "Zur Bedeutung der Mündlichkeit in Martials Epigrammbüchern I–XII", in: Vogt-Spira (ed.) 221–34.

Burnyeat, M.F. (1997) "Postscript on silent reading", *CQ* 47, 74–76.

Busch, Stephan (1999) *Versus balnearum. Die antike Dichtung über Bäder und Baden im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Bütler, Hans-Peter (1970) *Die geistige Welt des jüngeren Plinius. Studien zur Thematik seiner Briefe*, Heidelberg.

Buttrey, T. V. (1975) "Domitian's perpetual censorship and the numismatic evidence", *CJ* 71, 26–34.

——(1980) *Documentary Evidence for the Chronology of the Flavian Titulature*, Meisenheim am Glan.

Caerols, José J. (1995) *Sacra via*, Madrid.

Cairns, Francis (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry*, Edinburgh.

Caldelli, Maria Letizia (1993) *L'agon capitolinus: storia e protagonisti dall' istituzione domizianea al IV secolo*, Rome.

Cameron, Alan (1976) *Circus Factions. Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*, Oxford.

——(1993) *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford.
——(1995) *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton.
Cancik, Hubert (1965) *Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P. Papinius Statius*, Hildesheim.
——(1968) "Eine epikureische Villa, Statius Silv. II 2: Villa Surrentina", *AU* 11:1, 62–75.
——(1971) "Amphitheater. Zum Problem der 'Gesamtinterpretation' am Beispiel von Statius, Silve II 5: Leo mansuetus", *AU* 14:3, 66–81.
——(1973) "Römischer Religionsunterricht in apostolischer Zeit. Ein pastoralgeschichtlicher Versuch zu Statius, Silve V 3, 176–84", in: H. Feld and J. Nolte (eds.) *Wort Gottes in der Zeit* (*Festschrift* for K. H. Schelke) Düsseldorf, 181–97.
——(1978) "Tibur Vopisci. Statius, Silve I 3: Villa Tiburtina Manilii Vopisci", *Boreas* 1, 116–34.
——(1986) "Statius, 'Silvae'. Ein Bericht über die Forschung seit Friedrich Vollmer (1898)", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 2681–726.
Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard (1971) "Ein Mahl vor Hercules. Ein Versuch zu Statius, Silve IV 6: Hercules Epitrapezios", *AU* 14:3, 43–65.
Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, and Hubert Cancik (1982) "Gesellschaftliche Bedingungen der römischen Erotik", in: L. Hieber and R. W. Müller (eds.) *Gegenwart der Antike*, Frankfurt a. M. and New York, 29–54.
Canobbio, Alberto (1993) "Sulla cronologia del V libro di Marziale", *Athenaeum* n.s. 72, 540–50.
Carradice, Ian A. (1979) "The banishment of the father of Claudius Etruscus: numismatic evidence", *LCM* 4, 101–103.
——(1983) *Coinage and Finances in the Reign of Domitian A.D. 81–96*, Oxford.
Carratello, Ugo (1980) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber. Introduzione e testo critico*, Genoa (reprinted Rome, 1981).
Cartault, A. (1903) "Sur un emploi particulier des noms propres dans les Épigrammes de Martial", in: *Mélanges G. Boissier*, Paris, 103–13.
Castner, Catherine J., (1988) *Prosopography of Roman Epicureans from the Second Century B.C. to the Second Century A.D.*, Frankfurt am Main.
Cavallo, Guglielmo (1985) "Donne che leggono, donne che scrivono", in: R. Raffaelli (ed.), *Vicende e figure femminili in Grecia e a Roma*, Ancona, 517–26.
Cawsey, Fiona J. (1983) "Statius, *Silvae* II.iv: more than an ex-parrot?", *PACA* 17, 69–84.
Champlin, Edward J. (1978) "The life and times of Calpurnius Siculus", *JRS* 68, 95–110.
——(1980) *Fronto and Antonine Rome*, Cambridge, Mass.
——(1981) "Owners and neighbours at Ligures Baebiani", *Chiron* 11, 239–64.
——(1986) "History and the date of Calpurnius Siculus", *Philologus* 130, 104–12.
——(1989) "The life and times of Calpurnius Piso", *MH* 46, 101–24.
——(1991) *Final Judgments. Duty and emotion in Roman wills, 200 B.C. – A.D. 250*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Chartier, Roger (1990) "Muße und Geselligkeit. Lautes Lesen im Europa der Neuzeit", in: id., *Lesewelten. Buch und Lektüre in der frühen Neuzeit* (tr. B. Schleinitz and R. Stäblein), Frankfurt am Main, New York, and Paris, 146–90.
Chastagnol, André (1973) "La naissance de l'ordo senatorius", *MEFRA* 85, 583–607.
Cichorius, Conrad (1922) *Römische Studien. Historisches Epigraphisches Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, Leipzig and Berlin.

Citroni, Mario (1968) "Motivi di polemica letteraria negli epigrammi di Marziale", *DialArch* 2, 259–301.

——(1969) "La teoria lessinghiana dell'epigramma e le interpretazioni moderne di Marziale", *Maia* 21, 215–43.

——(1970) "Un proemio di Marziale (I 3)", in: *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Rome, 81–91.

——(1975) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton liber I. Introduzione, testo, apparato critico e commento*, Florence.

——(1982) "La carriera del centurione A. Pudens e il rango sociale dei primipilari. Interpretazione di Marziale 5.48 e 6.58.7–10", *Maia* 34, 247–57.

——(1987) "Marziale e i luoghi della Cispadana", in: *Cispadana e letteratura antica*, Bologna, 135–57.

——(1988) "Pubblicazione e dediche dei libri in Marziale", *Maia* 40, 3–39 (revised in *Marco Valerio Marziale. Epigrammi* (intr. M. C., tr. M. Scàndola, notes E. Merli), 2 vols., Milan 1996, 5–64.

——(1989) "Marziale e la Letteratura per i Saturnali (poetica dell' intrattenimento e cronologia della pubblicazione dei libri)", *ICS* 14, 201–26.

——(1990) "I destinatari contemporanei", in: *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, vol. 3: *La ricezione del testo*, Rome, 53–116.

——(1991) "Ovidio e l'evoluzione del rapporto poeta-pubblico tra tarda repubblica e prima età imperiale", in: Pani (ed.) 133–66.

——(1992) "Letteratura per i Saturnali e poetica dell'intrattenimento", *SIFC* 85, 425–47.

——(1995) *Poesia e lettori in Roma antica. Forme della comunicazione letteraria*, Rome and Bari.

Claridge, Amanda (1998) *Rome. An Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford and New York.

Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist (1984) *Mikhail Bakhtin*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.

Classen, C. Joachim (1985) "Martial", *Gymnasium* 92, 329–49.

Clauss, Manfred (1999) *Kaiser und Gott. Herrscherkult im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Clinton, Kevin (1972) "Publius Papinius St[---] at Eleusis", *TAPhA* 103, 79–82.

Cloud, Duncan (1989), "The client-patron relationship: emblem and reality in Juvenal's first book", in: Wallace-Hadrill (ed.) 205–18.

Coarelli, Filippo (1993) *Dintorni di Roma*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1981), Rome and Bari.

Coffey Michael, (1989) *Roman Satire*, 2nd edition (1st edition London and New York 1976), Bristol.

Coleman, Kathleen M. (1982) "Vibius Maximus and the writing of history", *PACA* 16, 25–27.

——(1983) "An African at Rome: Statius, *Silvae* 4.5", *PACA* 17, 85–99.

——(1986) "The emperor Domitian and literature", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 3087–115.

——(1988) *Statius. Siluae IV. Edited with an English translation and commentary*, Oxford (reprinted London, 1998).

——(1990) "Fatal charades: Roman executions staged as mythological enactments", *JRS* 80, 44–73.

——(1993) "Launching into history: aquatic displays in the Early Empire", *JRS* 83, 48–74.

——(1996) "Ptolemy Philadelphus and the Roman amphitheater", in: Slater (ed.), 49–68.

——(1998a) "Martial Book 8 and the politics of 93", *PLLS* 10, 337–57.
——(1998b) "The *liber spectaculorum*: perpetuating the ephemeral", in: Grewing (ed.), 15–36.
——(1999) "Mythological figures as spokespersons in Statius' Silvae", in: *Im Spiegel des Mythos. Bilderwelt und Lebenswelt/ Lo specchio del mito. Immaginario e realtà* (ed. F. de Angelis and S. Muth), Wiesbaden, 67–80.
——(2000) "Latin literature after AD 96. Change or continuity?", *AJAH* 15 (dated 1990, published 2000).
Colton, Robert E. (1993) *Juvenal's Use of Martial's Epigrams. A study of literary influence*, Amsterdam.
Corbett, Philip (1986) *The Scurra*, Edinburgh.
Corti, Rossella (1991a) "La tematica dell''otium' nelle 'Silvae' di Stazio", in: Pani (ed.) 189–224.
——(1991b) "Commentare le *Silvae* di Stazio (a proposito di un'edizione e commento al IV libro)", *Maia* 43, 115–42 (review article over Coleman 1988).
Courbier, Mireille (1987) "L'écriture dans l'espace public romain", in: *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle après J.- C.)* Rome, 27–60.
——(1991) "L'écriture en quête de lecteurs", in: Humphrey (ed.), 99–118.
Courtney, Edward (1971) "Further remarks on the *Silvae* of Statius", *BICS* 18, 95–97.
——(1980) *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London.
——(1984) "Criticisms and elucidations of the *Silvae* of Statius", *TAPhA* 114, 327–41.
——(1987) "Imitation, chronologie littéraire et Calpurnius Siculus", *REL* 65, 148–57.
——(1990) *P. Papini Stati Silvae*, Oxford.
——(1993) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford.
——(1995) *Musa Lapidaria. A selection of Latin verse inscriptions*, Atlanta.
Crook, John (1955) *Consilium principis*, Cambridge.
Curcio, G. G. (1893) *Studio su P. Papinio Stazio*, Catania.
Dack, Edmond van 't (1963) "A studiis, a bybliothecis", *Historia* 12, 177–84.
Daltrop, Georg, Ulrich Hausmann, and Max Wegner (1961) *Die Flavier* (*Das römische Herrscherbild* 2.1), Berlin.
Dam, Harm-Jan van (1984) *P. Papinius Statius. Silvae Book II. A commentary*, Leiden.
——(1986) "Statius, 'Silvae'. Forschungsbericht 1974–1984", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 2727–53.
——(1988) Review of Hardie 1983, *Gnomon* 60, 704–12.
——(1992) "Notes on Statius *Silvae* IV", *Mnemosyne* 45, 190–224.
D'Ambra, Eve (1993) *Private Lives, Imperial Virtues. The frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome*, Princeton.
Damon, Cynthia (1992) "Statius *Silvae* 4.9: *libertas Decembris*?", *ICS* 17, 301–08.
——(1997) *The Mask of the Parasite. A pathology of Roman patronage*, Ann Arbor.
D'Arms, John H. (1970) *Romans on the Bay of Naples. A social and cultural study of the villas and their owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400*, Cambridge, Mass.
——(1974) "Puteoli in the second century of the Roman empire: a social and economic study", *JRS* 64, 104–24.
——(1981) *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.

——(1984) "Control, companionship, and *clientela*: some social functions of the Roman communal meal", *ÉMC* 28, 327–48.

——(1990) "The Roman *convivium* and the idea of equality", in: O. Murray (ed.) *Sympotica. A Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, 308–20.

——(1991) "Slaves at Roman convivia", in: Slater (ed.) 171–83.

——(1999) "Performing culture: Roman spectacle and the banquets of the powerful", in: Bergmann and Kondoleon (eds.) 301–19.

Darwall-Smith, Robin (1994) "Albanum and the villas of Domitian", *Pallas* 40, 145–65.

——(1996) *Emperors and Architecture: A study of Flavian Rome*, Brussels.

Daube, David (1976) "Martial, father of three", *AJAH* 1, 145–47.

Davies, Penelope J.E. (2000) *Death and the Emperor. Roman imperial funerary monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*, Cambridge.

Delarue, Fernand (1974) "Stace et ses contemporains", *Latomus* 33, 536–48.

——(1996) "Paradis", in: Delarue et al. (eds.), 283–96.

Delarue, Fernand et al. (eds.) (1996) *Epicedion. Hommage à P. Papinius Statius 96–1996* (= *La licorne* 38), Poitiers.

Delz, Joseph (1992) "Zu den 'Silvae' des Statius", *MH* 49, 239–55.

Demougin, Ségolène (1975) "*Splendidus eques Romanus*", *Epigraphica* 37, 174–87.

Dessau, Hermann (1911) "Ein Freund Plutarchs in England", *Hermes* 46, 156–60.

Dewar, Michael (1994) "Laying it on with a trowel: the proem to Lucan and related texts", *CQ* 44, 199–211.

——(1996) "Episcopal and Epicurean villas: Venantius Fortunatus and the *Siluae*", in: Delarue et al. (eds.), 297–313.

Dixon, Suzanne (1993) "The meaning of gift and debt in the Roman elite", *ÉMC* 37, 451–64.

Dobson, Bryan (1970) "The centurionate and social mobility during the Principate", in: *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'Antiquité classique*, Paris, 99–116.

——(1978) *Die Primipilaren. Entwicklung und Bedeutung, Laufbahnen und Persönlichkeiten eines römischen Offiziersranges*, Cologne and Bonn.

Döpp, Siegmar (1993) "Saturnalien und lateinische Literatur", in: Döpp (ed.) 145–77.

——(1996) "Das Stegreifgedicht des Q. Sulpicius Maximus", *ZPE* 114, 99–114.

Döpp, Siegmar (ed.) (1993) *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen*, Trier.

Dorandi, Tiziano (1982) *Filodemo. Il buon re secondo Omero. Edizione, traduzione e commento*, Naples.

——(1991) "Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut. Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den antiken Schriftstellern", *ZPE* 87, 11–33.

——(1993) "Zwischen Autographie und Diktat: Momente der Textualität in der antiken Welt", in: W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (eds.) *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur*, Tübingen, 71–83.

Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. (1981) "Virgil's first *Eclogue*", *PLLS* 3, 29–182.

Dupont, Florence (1994) *L'invention de la littérature. De l'ivresse grecque au livre latin*, Paris.

Durand, René (1946) "In Martialem", *Latomus* 5, 257–61.

Duret, Luc (1986) "Dans l'ombre des plus grands: II. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de la latinité d'argent", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 3152–346.

Durry, Marcel (1938) *Pline le Jeune. Panégyrique de Trajan. Préfacé, édité et commenté*, Paris.

Dziatzko, Karl (1894) "Autor- und Verlagsrecht im Altertum", *RhM* 49, 559–76.
——(1900) *Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens*, Leipzig.
Eck, Werner (1970) *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter*, Munich.
——(1975) "Die Laufbahn eines Ritters aus Apri in Thrakien. Ein Beitrag zum Ausbau der kaiserlichen Administration in Italien", *Chiron* 5, 365–92.
——(1982) "Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/39" (part I) *Chiron* 12, 281–362.
——(1983) "Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/39" (part II) *Chiron* 13, 147–237.
——(1984) "Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period", in: F. Millar and E. Segal (eds.) *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, Oxford, 129–67 (enlarged and revised in: WE, *Tra epigrafia prosopografia e archeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati*, Rome 1996: 271–98).
——(1985a) "Statius *Silvae* 1.4 und Rutilius Gallicus als Proconsul Asiae II", *AJPh* 106, 475–84.
——(1985b) *Die Statthalter der germanischen Provinzen vom 1.–3. Jahrhundert*, Cologne and Bonn.
——(1997) "Der Kaiser, die Führungsschichten und die Administration des Reiches (von Vespasian bis zum Ende der antoninischen Dynastie)", in: id., *Die Verwaltung des römischen Reiches in der hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge*, vol. 2, Basle and Berlin, 3–145 (revised and enlarged version of *CAH*^{2} 11 [2000], 195–292).
Eden, P. T. (1990) "Problems in Martial (III)", *Mnemosyne* 43, 160–64.
——(1993) "Problems in Statius: *Silvae* (II)", *Mnemosyne* 46, 92–97.
Edmondson, J.C. (1996) "Dynamic arenas: gladiatorial presentations in the City of Rome and the construction of Roman society during the Early Empire", in: Slater (ed.), 69–112.
Edwards, Catherine (1993) *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
Ehlers, Widu-Wolfgang (1990) "Zur Rezitation der Satiren des Persius", in: Vogt-Spira (ed.) 171–81.
——(1996) "Von Bibern und Menschen. Anmerkungen zur 12. Satire Juvenals", in: C. Klodt (ed.) *Satura Lanx* (*Festschrift* for W. A. Krenkel) Hildesheim, 57–73.
Eisenstadt, Samuel N., and Louis Roniger (1980) "Patron-client relations as a model of structuring social exchange", *CSSH* 22, 42–77.
——(1984) *Patrons, Clients and Friends. Interpersonal relations and the structure of trust in society*, Cambridge.
Esteve-Forriol, José (1962) *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur, untersucht nach ihrer Topik und ihrem Motivschatz*, diss. Munich.
Evans, John Karl (1978) "The role of *suffragium* in imperial political decision-making: a Flavian example", *Historia* 27, 102–28.
Fabre, G. (1994) "Affranchis et esclaves impériaux sous Domitien" [or "Les affranchis et serviteurs impériaux sous Domitien"], *Pallas* 40, 337–55.
Fagan, Garrett G. (1999) *Bathing in Public in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor.
Fantham, Elaine (1996) *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*, Baltimore and London.
Färber, Hans (1936) *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, Munich.
——(1937) "Die Termini der Poetik in den Odenüberschriften der Horazoden", *Philologus* 92, 349–74.

Fears, J. Rufus (1977) *Princeps a diis electus: The divine election of the emperor as a political concept at Rome*, Rome.
——(1981) "The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology", *ANRW* 2.17.1, 3–141.
Fedeli, Paolo (1989) "I sistemi di produzione e diffusione", in: *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, vol. 2: *La circolazione del testo*, Rome 1989, 343–78.
Fein, Sylvia (1994) *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den litterati*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Felson, Nancy (1999) "Vicarious transport: fictive deixis in Pindar's *Pythian* Four", *HSCPh* 99, 1–33.
Finley, Moses I. (1983) *Politics in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
——(1985) *The Ancient Economy*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1973), London.
Finnegan, Ruth (1992) *Oral Poetry. Its nature, significance and social context*, reprint, with new preface, of the edition Cambridge 1977, Bloomington and Indianapolis.
Fowler, Don P. (1989) "First thoughts on closure: problems and prospects", *MD* 22, 75–122 = *Roman Constructions. Readings in postmodern Latin*, Oxford 2000, 239–83.
——(1995) "Martial and the book", *Ramus* 24, 31–58.
Fraenkel, Eduard (1957) *Horace*, Oxford.
Franchet d'Espèrey, Sylvie (1986) "Vespasien, Titus et la littérature", *ANRW* 2.35.5, 3048–86.
Fraser, P. M. (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford (3 vols.).
Frederiksen, Martin (1984) *Campania* (edited with additions by N. Purcell) Rome.
Frère, Henri (1930) "Stace, *Siluae IV praef.*, 5 suiv. K", in: *Mélanges P. Thomas*, Bruges, 300–11.
——(1961) *Stace. Silves* (with a translation by H. J. Izaac, revised by H. F.) 2nd edition (1st edition 1944), Paris (2 vols.).
Friedländer, Ludwig (1886) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*, Leipzig (2 vols.).
——(1919–23) *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine*, 9th–10th edition by G. Wissowa, Leipzig (4 vols.).
Friedländer, Paul (1912) *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius. Kunstbeschreibungen justinianischer Zeit*, Leipzig and Berlin.
Fugmann, Joachim (1992) "Nero oder Severus Alexander? Zur Datierung der Eklogen des Calpurnius Siculus", *Philologus* 136, 202–07.
Funaioli, Gino (1914) "Recitationes", *RE* II.1, 435–46.
Gale, Monica (1994) *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*, Cambridge.
Galinsky, G. Karl (1972) *The Herakles Theme. The adaptations of the hero in literature from Homer to the twentieth century*, Oxford.
Gamberale, Leopoldo (1982) "Libri e letteratura nel carme 22 di Catullo", *MD* 8, 143–69.
Gamberini, Federico (1983) *Stylistic Theory and Practice in the Younger Pliny*, Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York.
Garnsey, Peter, and Richard Saller (1987) *The Roman Empire. Economy, society and culture*, London.
Garrido-Hory, Marguerite (1981) *Martial et l'esclavage*, Paris.
——(1985) "Le statut de clientèle chez Martial", *DHA* 11, 381–414.
Garthwaite, John (1978) *Domitian and the Court Poets Martial and Statius*, diss. Cornell.

——(1984) "Statius, *Silvae* 3.4: on the fate of Earinus", *ANRW* 2.32.1, 111–24 (appendix to Ahl 1984a).
——(1989) "Statius' Retirement from Rome: *Silvae* 3.5", *Antichthon* 23, 81–91.
——(1990) "Martial, Book 6, on Domitian's moral censorship", *Prudentia* 22 (1990), 13–22.
——(1993) "The panegyrics of Domitian in Martial Book 9", *Ramus* 22, 78–102.
——(1998) "Putting a price on praise: Martial's debate with Domitian in Book 5", in: Grewing (ed.), 157–72.
Gatz, Bodo (1967) *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, Hildesheim.
Gavrilov, A.K. (1997) "Techniques of reading in Classical Antiquity", *CQ* 47, 56–73.
Gellner, Ernest (1977) "Patrons and clients", in: id. and J. Waterbury (eds.) 1–6.
Gellner, Ernest, and John Waterbury (eds.) (1977) *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies*, London.
Genette, Gérard (1987) *Seuils*, Paris.
Gentili, Bruno (1988) *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the fifth century* (tr. A. T. Cole; a 2nd edition with respect to the 1st Italian edition, Rome and Bari 1984), Baltimore and London.
Gessler, Jean (1946) "In Martialem", *Latomus* 5, 57–60.
Geyssen, John W. (1996) *Imperial Panegyric in Statius. A literary commentary on Silvae 1.1*, New York, etc.
Gibson, Sheila, Janet DeLaine and Amanda Claridge (1994) "The triclinium of the Domus Flavia: a new reconstruction", *PBSR* 62, 67–97.
Gilbert, Walter (1896) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1886), Leipzig.
Giovannini, Adalberto (1987) "Pline et les délateurs de Domitien", in: *Opposition et résistances à l'empire d'Auguste à Trajan* (*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 33), Geneva, 219–40.
Girard, Jean-Louis (1981) "Domitien et Minerve: une prédilection impériale", *ANRW* 2.17.1, 233–45.
Giuliani, Cairoli F. (1970) *Forma Italiae* I.7: *Tibur* 1, Rome.
Gold, Barbara K. (1987) *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome*, Chapel Hill and London.
Gold, Barbara K. (ed.) (1982) *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, Austin.
Goldhill, Simon (1991) *The Poet's Voice. Essays on poetics and Greek literature*, Cambridge.
Golvin, Jean-Claude (1988) *L'amphithéâtre romain. Essai sur la théorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions*, Paris (2 vols.).
Gowers, Emily (1993) *The Loaded Table. Representations of food in Roman literature*, Oxford.
Graefenhain, Rudolfus (1892) *De more libros dedicandi apud scriptores Graecos et Romanos obvio*, diss. Marburg.
Green, Dennis (1990) "Hören und Lesen: Zur Geschichte einer mittelalterlichen Formel", in: W. Raible (ed.) *Erscheinungsformen kultureller Prozesse*, Tübingen, 23–44.
Grelle, Francesco (1980) "La 'correctio morum' nella legislazione flavia", *ANRW* 2.13, 340–65.
Grewing, Farouk (1997) *Martial, Buch VI. Ein Kommentar*, Göttingen.

Grewing, Farouk (ed.) (1998) *Toto notus in orbe. Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, Stuttgart.
Griffin, Jasper (1981) "Genre and real life in Latin poetry", *JRS* 71, 39–49 = *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, London 1985, 48–64.
Griffin, Miriam T. (1976) *Seneca. A Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford.
——(1984) *Nero. The end of a dynasty*, London.
Groningen, B. A. van (1963) "'Ἔκδοσις", *Mnemosyne* 16, 1–17.
Gsell, Stéphane (1893) *Essai sur le règne de l'empereur Domitien*, Paris.
Guillemin, Anne-Marie (1929) *Pline et la vie littéraire de son temps*, Paris.
——(1937) *Le public et la vie littéraire à Rome*, Paris.
Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. (1998) *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic epigrams in context*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
Habicht, Christian (1969) *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions* (*Altertümer von Pergamon* 8.3), Berlin.
Haelst, Joseph van (1989) "Les origines du codex", in: A. Blanchard (ed.) *Les débuts du codex*, Turnhout, 13–35.
Håkanson, Lennart (1969) *Statius' Silvae. Critical and exegetical remarks, with some notes on the Thebaid*, Lund.
Halfmann, Helmut (1986) *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich*, Stuttgart.
Hallström, A. (1910) "De aetate Antonii Diogenis", *Eranos* 10, 200—01.
Hampe, Roland (1972) *Sperlonga und Virgil*, Mayence.
Hands, A. R. (1968) *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*, London.
Hardie, Alex (1983) *Statius and the Silvae. Poets, patrons and epideixis in the Graeco-Roman world*, Liverpool.
——(1990) "Juvenal and the condition of letters: the seventh satire" *PLLS* 6, 145–209.
——(1996) "Statius and the *Carmen Saeculare* of 88", in: Delarue et al. (eds.), 261–82.
Harris, William V. (1989) *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.
Harte, R.H. (1935) "The praetorship of the younger Pliny", *JRS* 25, 51–54.
Heinze, Richard (1923) "Die horazische Ode", in: id., *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (ed. E. Burck) Darmstadt 1972[4] (= Stuttgart 1960[3]).
Hellegouarc'h, Joseph (1972) *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1963), Paris.
Helm, Rudolf (1906) *Lucian und Menipp*, Leipzig and Berlin.
——(1955) "M. Valerius Martialis", *RE* II.15A, 55–85.
Hemelrijk, Emily A. (1999) *Matrona Docta. Educated women in the Roman élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*, London and New York.
Henderson, John (1998) *A Roman Life. Rutilius Gallicus on paper & in stone*, Exeter.
Henriksén, Christer (1997) "Earinus: an imperial eunuch in the light of the poems of Martial and Statius", *Mnemosyne* 50, 281–94.
——(1998) "Martial und Statius", in: Grewing (ed.), 77–118.
——(1998–99) *Martial, Book IX. A commentary*, Uppsala (2 vols.).
Heraeus, Wilhelm (1976) *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton libri*, "editio correctior" by I. (= J.) Borovskij (original edition 1925), Leipzig.
Herrlinger, Gerhard (1930) *Totenklage um Tiere in der antiken Dichtung. Mit einem Anhang byzantinischer, mittellateinischer und neuhochdeutscher Tierepikedien*, Stuttgart.

Heuvel, H. (1936–37) "De inimicitiarum, quae inter Martialem et Statium fuisse dicunter, indiciis", *Mnemosyne* (ser. 3) 4, 299–330.
Highet, Gilbert (1954) *Juvenal the Satirist. A Study*, Oxford.
Hilberg, Isidor (1902) "Zur Biographie des Statius", *WS* 24, 514–18.
Hirschfeld, Otto (1905) *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, 2nd edition, Berlin.
Hirzel, Rudolf (1895) *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, Leipzig (2 vols.).
Hofmann, Walter (1983) "Martial und Domitian", *Philologus* 127, 238–46.
Holland, Louise Adams (1961) *Janus and the Bridge*, Rome.
Holzberg, Niklas (1986) "Neuansatz zu einer Martial-Interpretation", *WJA* 12, 197–215.
——(1988) *Martial*, Heidelberg.
Hopkins, Keith (1978a) *Conquerors and Slaves* (*Sociological Studies in Roman History* 1) Cambridge.
——(1978b) "Rules of evidence" (review article over Millar 1977) *JRS* 68, 178–86.
——(1983) *Death and Renewal* (*Sociological Studies in Roman History* 2) Cambridge.
Horsfall, Nicholas (1976) "The *collegium poetarum*", *BICS* 23, 79–95.
——(1989) *Cornelius Nepos. A selection, including the lives of Cato and Atticus*, Oxford.
——(1991) *Virgilio: l'epopea in alambicco*, Naples.
——(1996) *La cultura della plebs romana*, Barcelona.
Hose, Martin (1994) *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.
Housman, A. E. (1906) "The *Silvae* of Statius" *CR* 20, 37–47 = 1972: 2.637–55.
——(1907) "Corrections and explanations of Martial", *JPh* 30, 229–65 = 1972: 2.711–39.
——(1919) "Notes on Martial", *CQ* 13, 68–80 = 1972: 3.982–95.
——(1925) Review of Heraeus, *CR* 39, 199–203 = 1972: 3.1099–1104.
——(1972) *The Classical Papers*, ed. by J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear, Cambridge (3 vols.).
Howell, Peter (1980) *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*, London.
——(1995) *Martial. Epigrams V*, Warminster.
——(1998) "Martial's return to Spain", in: Grewing (ed.), 173–86.
Huelsen, Ch. (1889) "Zu Martial", *BPhW* 9, 683–84.
Humbert, Michel (1972) *Le remariage à Rome. Étude d'histoire juridique et sociale*, Milan.
Humphrey , J. H. (ed.) (1991) *Literacy in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor.
Huttner, Ulrich (1997) *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum*, Stuttgart.
Ianziti, Gary (1987) "Patronage and the production of history: the case of quattrocento Milan", in: Kent and Simons (eds.) 299–311.
Immisch, Otto (1911) "Zu Martial", *Hermes* 46, 481–517.
Izaac, H. J. (1930–33) *Martial. Épigrammes*, Paris (2 vols.).
Jal, Paul (1967) *Florus. Œuvres*, Paris.
Janson, Tore (1964) *Latin Prose Prefaces. Studies in literary conventions*, Stockholm.
Johnson, Terry, and Chris Dandeker (1989) "Patronage: relation and system", in: Wallace-Hadrill (ed.) 219–42.
Jones, Brian W. (1992) *The Emperor Domitian*, London and New York.

——(1996) *Suetonius. Domitian. Edited with introduction, commentary and bibliography*, London.
Jones, Christopher P. (1968) "A new commentary on the Letters of Pliny", *Phoenix* 22, 111–42.
——(1970) "Sura and Senecio", *JRS* 60, 98–104.
——(1971) *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford.
——(1978) *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.
——(1986) *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.
——(1991) "Dinner theater", in: Slater (ed.) 185–98.
Kajanto, Iiro (1965) *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki.
Kappelmacher, Alfred (1916) "Frontin in Martials Epigrammen", *WS* 38, 181–85.
Kaser, Max (1966) *Das römische Zivilprozessrecht*, Munich.
——(1971) *Das römische Privatrecht*, vol. 1, 2nd edition, Munich.
Kaster, Robert A., *C. Suetonius Tranquillus. De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus. Edited with a translation, introduction, and commentary*, Oxford.
Kay, Nigel M. (1985) *Martial Book XI: A commentary*, London.
Kenney, E. J. (1982) "Books and readers in the Roman world", in: *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 2: *Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 3–32.
Kent, F. W., with Patricia Simons (1987) "Renaissance patronage: an introductory essay", in: iid. (eds.) 1–21.
Kent, F. W., and Patricia Simons, with J. C. Eade (eds.) (1987) *Patronage, Art, and Society in Renaissance Italy*, Canberra and Oxford.
Ker, Walter C. A. (1968) *Martial. Epigrams*, revision, apparently by E. H. Warmington, of the 1st edition of 1919–20, Cambridge, Mass., and London (2 vols.).
Kershaw, Allan (1997) "Martial 9.44 and Statius", *CPh* 92, 269–72.
Kettering, Sharon (1986) *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France*, New York and Oxford.
Keydell, Rudolf (1962) "Epithalamium", *RAC* 5, 927–43.
Kißel, Walter (1990) *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, Heidelberg.
Kleberg, Tönnes (1965) *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike* (tr. E. Zunker; original Swedish edition 1962), Darmstadt.
Kleijwegt, Marc (1998) "*Extra fortunam est quidquid donatur amicis*: Martial on friendship", in: Grewing (ed.), 256–77.
——(1999) "A question of patronage: Seneca and Martial", *AC* 42, 105–09.
Kleiner, Fred S. (1991) "The trophy on the bridge and the Roman triumph over Nature", *AC* 60, 182–94.
Klodt, Claudia (1998) "Platzanlagen der Kaiser in der Beschreibung der Dichter", *Gymnasium* 105, 1–37.
Klotz, Alfredus (1911) *P. Papini Stati Silvae* ("Krohni copiis usus ... edidit A. K.") 2nd edition, Leipzig.
Konrad, Christoph F. (1982) "Quaestiones Tappulae", *ZPE* 48, 219–34.
Konstan, David (1995) "Patrons and friends", CPh 90, 328–42.
——(1997) *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge.
Krause, Jens-Uwe (1994) *Witwen und Waisen im römischen Reich*, vol. 1: *Verwitwung und Wiederverheiratung*, Stuttgart.
Krautter, Konrad (1992) "Lucan, Calpurnius Siculus und Nero", *Philologus* 136, 188–201.
Kroll, Wihelm (1924), *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart.
Krüger, Andreas (1998) *Die lyrische Kunst des Publius Papinius Statius in Silve II 2. Villa Surrentina Pollii Felicis*, Frankfurt a. M.

Kunkel, Wolfgang (1952) *Herkunft und soziale Stellung der römischen Juristen*, Weimar.
Kurke, Leslie (1991) *The Traffic in Praise. Pindar and the poetics of social economy*, Ithaca and London.
Kuthan, R. (1932) "Zu Martials Epigramm IV 79", *BPhW* 52, 782–83.
Kytzler, Bernhard (1960) "Beobachtungen zum Prooemium der Thebais", *Hermes* 88, 331–54.
LaFleur, Richard A. (1979) "*Amicitia* and the unity of Juvenal's first book", *ICS* 4, 158–77.
Laguna Mariscal, Gabriel (1992) *Estacio, Silvas III. Introducción, edición crítica, traducción y comentario*, Madrid.
——(1994) "Invitación al matrimonio: en torno a un pasaje estaciano (*Silv.* I 2, 161–200)", *Emérida* 62, 263–87.
——(1996) "Philosophical topics in Statius' *Silvae*: sources and aims", in: Delarue et al. (eds.), 247–59.
Lana, Italo (1951) "I ludi capitolini di Domiziano", *RFIC* 29, 145–60.
Landolfi, Luciano (1986) "I *lusus* simposiali di Catullo e Calvo o dell'improvvisazione conviviale neoterica", *QUCC* 24, 77–89.
Latte, Kurt (1960) *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich.
Laurens, Pierre (1989) *L'abeille dans l'ambre. Célébration de l'épigramme de l'époque alexandrine à la fin de la Renaissance*, Paris.
Lausberg, Heinrich (1989) *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 3rd edition (1st edition 1960), Stuttgart (2 vols.).
Leary, T.J. (1996) *Martial. Book XIV. The Apophoreta. Text with introduction and commentary*, London.
Lefèvre, Eckard (1989) "Plinius-Studien V. Vom Römertum zum Ästhetizismus. Die Würdigungen des älteren Plinius (3,5) Silius Italicus (3,7) und Martial (3,21)", *Gymnasium* 96, 113–28.
Lehmann, Erwin (1931) *Antike Martialausgaben*, diss. Jena.
Leiwo, Martti (1995) *Neapolitana. A study of population and language in Graeco-Roman Naples*, Helsinki.
Lendon, J.E. (1997) *Empire of Honour. The art of government in the Roman world*, Oxford.
Leppert, Manfred (1978) "Domina nympha. Überlegungen zum Faustinus-Epigramm von Sperlonga", *AA* 93, 554–73.
Leppin, Hartmut (1992a) *Histrionen. Untersuchungen zur sozialen Stellung von Bühnenkünstlern im Westen des Römischen Reiches zur Zeit der Republik und des Principats*, Bonn.
——(1992b) "Die Laus Pisonis als Zeugnis senatorischer Mentalität", *Klio* 74, 221–36.
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim (1973) "Zerstreute Anmerkungen über das Epigramm und einige der vornehmsten Epigrammatisten", in: id., *Werke*, ed. by H.G. Göpfert, vol. 5, Munich, 420–529 = *Sämtliche Schriften*, ed. by K. Lachmann, 3rd edition by F. Muncker, vol. 11, Stuttgart 1895, 214–315.
Levinson, Stephen C. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge.
Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (1979) *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*, Oxford.
Lohrisch, Hermannus (1905) *De Papinii Statii Silvarum poetae studiis rhetoricis*, diss. Halle.
Loriot, X. (1974) "Les *Fasti Ostienses* et le *dies imperii* de Gordien III", in: *Mélanges W. Seston*, Paris, 297–312.

Lotito, Gianfranco (1974–75) "Il tipo etico del liberto funzionario di corte (Stazio, *Silvae* III 3 e V 1)", *DialArch* 8, 275–383.
Lytle, Guy Fitch (1987) "Friendship and patronage in Renaissance Europe", in: Kent and Simons (eds.) 47–61.
Lytle, Guy Fitch, and Stephen Orgel (eds.) (1981) *Patronage in the Renaissance*, Princeton.
Maas, Paul (1912) "Γελωτοποιοί", *RE* 7, 1019–21.
MacDonald, William L. (1982) *The Architecture of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1: *An Introductory Study*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1965).
Maderna, Caterina (1988) *Iuppiter Diomedes und Merkur als Vorbilder für römische Bildnisstatuen. Untersuchungen zum römischen statuarischen Idealporträt*, Heidelberg.
Marache, René (1961) "La revendication sociale chez Martial et Juvénal", *RCCM* 3, 30–67.
Markland(us) Jer. (1827) *P. Papinii Statii libri quinque Silvarum*, 2nd edition (1st edition London 1728), Dresden and London.
Marquardt, Joachim (1886) *Das Privatleben der Römer*, 2nd edition by A. Mau, Leipzig (2 vols.).
Martin, Alain (1986) "*Princeps, dominus, dux.* Les dénominations impériales dans les poèmes de Martial", in: *Hommages à Josef Veremans*, Brussels, 201–07.
——(1987a) "Domitien *Germanicus* et les documents grecs d'Egypte", *Historia* 36, 73–82.
——(1987b) *La titulature épigraphique de Domitien*, Frankfurt am Main.
——(1988) "Domitien et les documents égyptiens de l'an 3", in: *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology*, Athens, 2.465–70.
Martin, Josef (1931) *Symposion. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form*, Paderborn.
Mau, August (1900) "Comissatio", *RE* 4, 610–19.
McDermott, William C., and Anne E. Orentzel (1977) "Silius Italicus and Domitian", *AJPh* 98, 24–34.
——(1979) *Roman Portraits. The Flavian-Trajanic period*, New York and London.
McDonnell, Myles (1996) "Writing, copying, and autograph manuscripts in ancient Rome", *CQ* 46, 469–91.
McGinn, Thomas A.J. (1998) *Prostitution, Sexuality, and the Law in Ancient Rome*, New York and Oxford.
McKay, Alexander G. (1998) "Domitianic Construction at Cumae (Campania)", in: G. Schmeling and J.D. Mikalson, *Qui miscuit utile dulci* (*Festschrift* for P.L. MacKendrick), Wanaconda, Ill., 223–42.
Merli, Elena (1993) "Ordinamento degli epigrammi e strategie cortigiane negli esordi dei libri I–XII di Marziale", *Maia* 45, 229–56.
——(1996a) "Note a Marziale (8, 50; 10, 7; 11, 90; 13, 118)", *MD* 36, 211–23.
——(1996b) Notes in: *Marco Valerio Marziale. Epigrammi* (intr. M. Citroni, tr. M. Scàndola, notes E. M.), 2 vols., Milan.
——(1998) "Epigrammzyklen und 'serielle Lektüre' in den Büchern Martials. Überlegungen und Beispeile", in: Grewing (ed.), 139–56.
Mette-Dittmann, Angelika (1991) *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus. Eine Untersuchung im Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps*, Stuttgart.
Mezger, Werner (1993) "Antike Motive und Elemente in der Fastnacht des Spätmittelalters? Zu Kontiniuität und Diskontinuität der Traditionen des klassischen Altertums", in: Döpp (ed.) 239–64.
Michel, Jacques (1962) *Gratuité en droit romain*, Brussels.

Micocki, Tomasz (1995) *Sub specie deae. Les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique*, Rome.
Mielsch, Harald (1987) *Die römische Villa. Architektur und Lebensform*, Munich.
Millar, Fergus (1967) "Emperors at work", *JRS* 57, 9–19.
——(1992) *The Emperor in the Roman World*, 2nd edition (1st edition 1977), London.
Mingazzini, Paulinus, and Fridericus Pfister (1946) *Forma Italiae* I.2: *Surrentum*, Florence.
Mitchell, Stephen (1998) "Herod's people. Roman-Jewish sympathies in the rise of Christianity". *TLS*, March 6, 12–13.
Moles, John (1990) "The kingship orations of Dio Chrysostom", *PLLS* 6, 297–375.
Möllendorff, Peter von (1995) *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie. Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bachtin*, Tübingen.
Momigliano, Arnaldo D. (1935) "Sodales Flauiales Titiales e colto di Giove", *BCAR* 63, 165–71 = *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Rome 1975 (2 vols.) 1.657–66.
Mommsen, Theodor (1887–88) *Römisches Staatsrecht*, 3rd edition, Leipzig (2 *Bände* in 5 vols.).
Montevecchi, Orsolina (1981) "Vespasiano acclamato dagli Alessandrini. Ancora su P.Fouad 8", *Aegyptus* 61, 155–70.
Morelli, Camillo (1916) "Floro e il certame capitolino", *A&R* 19, 97–106.
Morford, Mark (1985) "Nero's patronage and participation in literature and the arts", *ANRW* 2.32.3, 2003–31.
Moser, Dietz-Rüdiger (1990) "Lachkultur des Mittelalters? Michael Bachtin und die Folgen seiner Theorie", *Euphorion* 84, 89–111.
Mountford, J. F., and J. T. Schultz (1930) *Index rerum et nominum in scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati tractatorum*, Ithaca.
Moussy, Claude (1966) *Gratia et sa famille*, Paris.
Mratschek-Halfmann, Sigrid (1993) *Divites et praepotentes. Reichtum und soziale Stellung in der Literatur der Prinzipatszeit*, Stuttgart.
Mulder, Heine M. (1954) *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber secundus commentario exegetico aestheticoque instructus*, Groningen.
Murison, Charles Leslie (1999), *Rebellion and Reconstruction. Galba to Domitian. An historical commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 64–67 (A.D. 68–96)*, Atlanta
Murray, Oswyn (1985) "Symposium and genre in the poetry of Horace", *JRS* 75, 39–50.
Muth, Robert (1954) "'Hymenaios' und 'Epithalamios'", *WS* 67, 5–45.
Myers, K. Sara (2000) "'*Miranda fides*': poet and patrons in paradoxographical landscapes in Statius' *Silvae*", MD 44, 103–38.
Nauta, Ruurd R. (1987) "Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* as Saturnalian literature", *Mnemosyne* 40, 69–96.
——(1990) "Gattungsgeschichte als Rezeptionsgeschichte am Beispiel der Entstehung der Bukolik", *A&A* 36, 116–37.
——(1994) "Historicizing reading: the aesthetics of reception and Horace's 'Soracte ode'", in: I. J. F. de Jong and J. P. Sullivan (eds.) *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature*, Leiden, New York, and Cologne, 207–30.
Nesselhauf, Herbert (1960) "Umriss einer Geschichte des obergermanischen Heeres", *JRGZ* 7, 151–79.
Neuhauser, Walter (1958) *Patronus und Orator. Eine Geschichte der Begriffe von ihren Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit*, Innsbruck.

Neumeister, Christoff (1991) *Das antike Rom. Ein literarischer Stadtführer*, Munich.
Newlands, Carole E. (1988) "Horace and Statius at Tibur: an interpretation of *Silvae* 1.3", *ICS* 13, 95–111.
——(1991) "*Silvae* 3.1 and Statius' poetic temple", *CQ* 41, 438–52.
Newman, John Kevin (1990) *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility*, Hildesheim.
Newmyer, Stephen Thomas (1979) *The Silvae of Statius. Structure and theme*, Leiden.
Nielsen, Inge (1990) *Thermae et Balnea. The architecture and cultural history of Roman public baths*, Aarhus (2 vols.).
Nilsson, Martin P. (1921) "Saturnalia", *RE* II.2.1, 201–11.
Nisbet, R. G. M. (1978) "*Felicitas* at Surrentum (Statius *Silvae* II 2)", *JRS* 68, 1–11.
Nisbet, R. G. M. and Margaret Hubbard (1970) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book I*, Oxford.
——(1978) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book II*, Oxford.
Nolte, Hans-Heinrich (1989) "Patronage und Klientel: Das Konzept in der Forschung", in: id. (ed.) *Patronage und Klientel. Ergebnisse einer polnisch-deutschen Konferenz*, Cologne and Vienna, 1–17.
Norden, Eduard (1899) "Ein Panegyrikus auf Augustus in Virgils Aeneis", *RhM* 54, 467–82 = EN, *Kleine Schriften zum klassischen Altertum* (ed. by B. Kytzler), Berlin 1966, 422–36.
Obermayer, Hans Peter (1998) *Martial und der Diskurs über männliche "Homosexualität" in der Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen.
Önnerfors, Alf (1974) *Vaterporträts in der römischen Poesie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Horaz, Statius und Ausonius*, Stockholm.
Page, Denys L. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus. An introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry*, Oxford.
Pani, Mario (ed.) (1991) *Continuità e trasformazione fra Repubblica e Principato. Istituzioni, politica, società*, Bari.
Pavlovskis, Zoja (1973) *Man in an Artificial Landscape. The marvels of civilization in Imperial Roman literature*, Leiden.
Pederzani, Ombretta (1995) *Il talamo, l'albero e lo specchio. Saggio di commento a Stat. Silv. I 2, II 3, III 4*, Bari.
Pekáry, Thomas (1985) *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft dargestellt anhand der Schriftquellen*, Berlin.
Perlwitz, Olaf (1992) *Titus Pomponius Atticus. Untersuchungen zur Person eines einflussreichen Ritters in der ausgehenden römischen Republik*, Stuttgart.
Pflaum, Hans-Georg (1960–61), *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Paris (4 vols.).
——(1982) *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain. Supplément*, Paris.
Pitcher, Roger A. (1984) "Flaccus, friend of Martial", *Latomus* 43, 414–23.
——(1985) "The dating of Martial Books XIII and XIV", *Hermes* 113, 330–39.
Plass, Paul (1988) *Wit and the Writing of History. The rhetoric of historiography in Imperial Rome*, Madison and London.
——(1995) *The Game of Death in Ancient Rome. Arena sport and political suicide*, Madison and London.
Postgate, J. P. (1906) "On three passages of the *Silvae* of Statius", *CR* 20, 306–07.
Premerstein, Anton von (1904) "Lex Tappula", *Hermes* 39, 327–47.

Price, S. R. F. (1984) *Rituals and Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.

Prinz, Karl (1929) "Martialerklärungen II", *Wiener Studien* 47, 109–16.

Puelma, Mario (1995) "Dichter und Gönner bei Martial", in: id, *Labor et lima. Kleine Schriften und Nachträge* (ed. I. Fasel), Basle, 415–66.

——(1996) "Ἐπίγραμμα - *epigramma*: Aspekte einer Wortgeschichte", *MH* 53, 123–39.

Quinn, Kenneth (1982) "The poet and his audience in the Augustan age", *ANRW* 2.30.1, 75–180.

Raepsaet-Charlier, Marie-Thérèse (1987) *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (Ier–IIe siècles)*, Louvain.

Rawson, Elizabeth (1987) "*Discrimina ordinum*: the *lex Julia theatralis*", *PBSR* 55, 83–114 = ER, *Roman Culture and Society. Collected Papers*, Oxford 1991, 508–45.

Reeve, M. D. (1980), "Two notes on the Medieval tradition of Martial", *Prometheus* 6, 193–200.

——(1983) "Martial", in: L. D. Reynolds (ed.) *Texts and Transmission: A survey of the Latin classics*, Oxford, 239–44.

——(1984) "The addressee of *Laus Pisonis*", *ICS* 9, 42–48.

Reitzenstein, Richard (1893) *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*, Giessen.

——(1907) "Epigramm", *RE* 6, 71–111.

Reure, L'abbé (1891) *Les gens de lettres et leurs protecteurs à Rome*, Paris.

Ribbeck, Otto (1888) "Agroikos. Eine ethologische Studie", *Abh. d. kgl. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl.* 10, Leipzig, 1–68.

Richardson, jr., Lawrence (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore and London.

Richlin, Amy (1992) *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and aggression in Roman humor*, 2nd edition (1st edition New Haven and London 1983), New York and London.

Rieks, Rudolf (1967) *Homo, humanus, humanitas. Zur Humanität in der lateinischen Literatur des ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts*, Munich.

Riemann, Hans (1980) "Sperlongaprobleme", in: *Forschungen und Funde. Festschrift B. Neutsch*, Innsbruck, 371–83.

Robert, Louis (1930) "Études d'épigraphie grecque", *RPh* 56, 25–60 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 2, Amsterdam 1969, 1125–60.

——(1968) "Dans l'amphithéâtre et dans les jardins de Néron. Une épigramme de Lucillius", *CRAI*, 280–88 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 5, Amsterdam 1989, 552–60.

——(1970) "Deux concours grecs à Rome", *CRAI*, 6–27 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 5, Amsterdam 1989, 647–68.

Roberts, Colin H., and T. C. Skeat (1983) *The Birth of the Codex*, London.

Robinson, Olivia F. (1992) *Ancient Rome. City planning and administration*, London and New York.

Rodríguez-Almeida, Emilio (1982–83) "Riflessi di Roma in due epigrammi di M. Valerio Marziale", *BCAR* 88, 87-98.

Römer, Franz (1994) "Mode und Methode in der Deutung panegyrischer Dichtung der nachaugusteischen Zeit", *Hermes* 122, 95–113.

Rösler, Wolfgang (1980) *Dichter und Gruppe. Eine Untersuchung zu den Bedingungen und zur historischen Funktion früher griechischer Lyrik am Beispiel Alkaios*, Munich.

——(1983) "Über Deixis und einige Aspekte mündlichen und schriftlichen Stils in antiker Lyrik", *WJA* 9, 7–28.

——(1985) "Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell''io' nella lirica greca arcaica", *QUCC* 19, 131–44.

——(1986) "Michail Bachtin und die Karnevalskultur im antiken Griechenland", *QUCC* 23, 25–44.

——(1990) "Realitätsbezug und Imagination in Sapphos Gedicht Φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος", in: W. Kullmann and M. Reichel (eds.) *Der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zur Literatur bei den Griechen*, Tübingen, 271–87.

——(1993) "Über Aischrologie im archaischen und klassischen Griechenland", in: Döpp (ed.) 75–97.

Rouland, Norbert (1979) *Pouvoir politique et dépendance personnelle dans l'Antiquité romaine. Genèse et rôle des rapports de clientèle*, Brussels.

Royo, Manuel (1999) *Domus imperatoriae. Topographie, formation et imaginaire des palais impériaux du Palatin (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome.

Rudd, Niall (1966) *The Satires of Horace*, Cambridge.

——(1976) *Lines of Enquiry*, Cambridge.

Russell, Donald A., and Nigel G. Wilson (1981) *Menander Rhetor. Edited with translation and commentary*, Oxford.

Sage, Evan T. (1919) "The publication of Martial's poems", *TAPhA* 50, 168–76.

Saggese, Paolo (1994) "Lo *scurra* in Marziale", *Maia* 46, 53–59.

Saller, Richard P. (1982) *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge.

——(1983) "Martial on patronage and literature", *CQ* 33, 246–57.

——(1989) "Patronage and friendship in Early Imperial Rome: drawing the distinction", in: Wallace-Hadrill (ed.) 49–62.

——(1994) *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge.

Salles, Catherine (1986) "L'écrivain romain face au pouvoir impérial: la censure littéraire au Ier siècle de notre ère", *Latomus* 45, 751–67.

——(1992) *Lire à Rome*, Paris.

Salomies, Olli I. (1982) "Quintilian und Vitorius Marcellus", *Arctos* 16, 153–58.

——(1992) *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*, Helsinki.

Sartori, Franco (1985) "La ricchezza di Stella e Violentilla", *Index* 13, 201–21.

Sauter, Franz (1934) *Der römische Kaiserkult bei Martial und Statius*, Stuttgart and Berlin.

Scamuzzi, Ugo (1966) "Contributo ad una obiettiva conoscenza della vita e dell'opera di Marco Valerio Marziale", *RSC* 14, 149–209.

Scheid, John (1990) *Le collège des frères arvales. Étude prosopographique du recrutement (69–304)*, Rome.

— (1998) *Commentarii fratrum arualium qui supersunt. Les copies épigraphiques des protocols annuels de la confrérie Arvale (21 av. – 304 ap. J.-C.* (in collaboration with Paola Tassini and Jörg Rüpke), Rome.

Scheithauer, Andrea (2000) *Kaiserliche Bautätigkeit in Rom. Das Echo in der antiken Literatur*, Stuttgart.

Schmidt, Ernst A. (1972) *Poetische Reflexion. Virgils Bukolik*, Munich.

Schmidt, Steffen W., Laura Guasti, Carl H. Landé, James C. Scott (eds.) (1977) *Friends, Followers, and Factions. A reader in political clientelism*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

Schmidt, Wilhelm (1908) *Geburtstag im Altertum*, Giessen.

Scholz, Manfred G. (1980) *Hören und Lesen. Studien zur primären Rezeption der Literatur im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Wiesbaden.
Schrijvers, P. H. (1973) "Comment terminer une ode? Étude sur les façons différentes dont Horace termine ses court poèmes", *Mnemosyne* 26, 140–59.
——(1990) *Crise poètique et poèsie de crise. La réception de Lucain aux XIX*^e^ *et XX*^e^ *siècles, suivi d'une interprétation de la scène "César àTroie" (La Pharsale, 9,950–999)* Amsterdam.
Schröder, Bianca-Jeanette (1999) *Titel und Text. Zur Entwicklung lateinischer Gedichtüberschriften. Mit Untersuchungen zu lateinischen Buchtiteln, Inhaltsverzeichnissen und anderen Gliederungsmitteln*, Berlin and New York.
Schuster, Mauriz (1930) "Eine Eigentümlichkeit Martials", *BPhW* 50, 219–22.
Schwartz, Eduardus (1889) *Coniectanea*, Rostock.
Scott, James C. (1972) "Patron-client politics and political change in Southeast Asia", quoted after the reprint in: S. W. Schmidt et al. (eds.) 1977, 123–46.
——(1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance. Hidden transcripts*, New Haven and London.
Scott, Kenneth (1936) *The Imperial Cult under the Flavians*, Stuttgart and Berlin.
Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966) *The Letters of Pliny. A historical and social commentary*, Oxford.
Sittl, Carl (1890) *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig.
Slater, William J. (ed.) (1991) *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor.
——(1996) *Roman Theater and Society. E. Togo Salman Papers 1*, Ann Arbor.
Slings, Simon R. (1990) "The I in personal Archaic lyric: an introduction", in: id. (ed.) *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric*, Amsterdam, 1–30.
Smith, Barbara Herrnstein (1968) *Poetic Closure. A study of how poems end*, Chicago.
Sommer, Richard (1926) "T. Pomponius Atticus und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken", *Hermes* 61, 389–422.
Spisak, Art L. (1998) "Gift-Giving in Martial", in: Grewing (ed.) 1998, 243–55.
Stärk, Ekkehard (1995) *Kampanien als geistige Landschaft. Interpretationen zum antiken Bild des Golfs von Neapel*, Munich.
Starr, Raymond J. (1987) "The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world", *CQ* 37, 213–23.
——(1990–91) "Reading aloud: *lectores* and Roman reading", *CJ* 86, 337–43.
Steele, R. B. (1930) "Interrelation of the Latin poets under Domitian", *CPh* 25, 328–42.
Steinmetz, Peter (1982) *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt*, Wiesbaden.
Stramaglia, Antonio (1999) *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-romano*, Bari.
Strobel, Karl (1986a) "Der Aufstand des L. Antonius Saturninus und der sogenannte zweite Chattenkrieg Domitians, *Tyche* 1, 203–20.
——(1986b) "Zur Rekonstruktion der Laufbahn des C. Velius Rufus", *ZPE* 64, 265–86.
——(1989) *Die Donaukriege Domitians*, Bonn.
Stuiber, Alfred (1978) "Geschenk", *RAC* 10, 685–703.
Suerbaum, Werner (1968) *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter. Livius Andronicus. Naevius. Ennius*, Hildesheim.
Sullivan, John P. (1985) *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*, Ithaca and London.

——(1991) *Martial: The unexpected classic. A literary and historical study*, Cambridge.
Syme, Ronald (1936) "Flavian wars and frontiers", *CAH* 11, 131–37.
——(1937a) "The colony of Cornelius Fuscus: An Episode in the *Bellum Neronis*", *AJPh* 58, 7–18 = *Danubian Papers*, Bucharest 1971, 73–83.
——(1937b) "Pamphylia from Augustus to Vespasian", *Klio* 30, 227–31 = *RP* 1.42–46.
——(1939) *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.
——(1953) Review of A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari dell'impero Romano dal 30 avanti Christo al 613 dopo Christo* (Rome 1952) *JRS* 43, 148–61 = *RP* 1.231–59.
——(1958) *Tacitus*, Oxford (2 vols.).
——(1968) "People in Pliny", *JRS* 58, 135–51 = *RP* 2.694–723.
——(1978) "'Donatus' and the like", *Historia* 27, 588–603 = *RP* 3.1105–19
——(1979) "Problems about Janus", *AJPh* 100, 188–212 = *RP* 3.1179–97.
——(1980a) *Some Arval Brethren*, Oxford.
——(1980b) "Hadrianic proconsuls of Africa", *ZPE* 37, 1–18 = *RP* 3.1303–15.
——(1982–83) "Spaniards at Tivoli", *AncSoc* 13–14, 241–63 = *RP* 4.94–114.
——(1983a) "Domitian. The last years", *Chiron* 13, 121–46 = *RP* 4.252–77.
——(1983b) "Antistius Rusticus, a consular from Corduba", *Historia* 32, 359–74 = *RP* 4.278–94.
——(1983c) "Eight consuls from Patavium", *PBSR* 51, 102–24 = *RP* 4.371–96.
——(1984) "Statius on Rutilius Gallicus", *Arctos* 18, 149–56 = *RP* 5.514–20.
——(1985a) "Correspondents of Pliny", *Historia* 34, 324–59 = *RP* 5.440–77.
——(1985b) "Curtailed tenures of consular legates", *ZPE* 59, 265–79 = *RP* 5.499–513.
——(1985c) "The paternity of polyonymous consuls", *ZPE* 61, 191–98 = *RP* 5.639–47.
——(1988) "Prefects of the City, Vespasian to Trajan", in: *RP* 5.608–21.
——(1991a) "Hadrian's autobiography: Servianus and Sura", in: *RP* 6.398–408.
——(1991b) "Some unrecognized authors from Spain", in: *RP* 6.463–72.
——(1991c) *RP* 7 (various formerly unpublished studies on Pliny and his circle)
Szelest, Hanna (1959) "Martial und Silius Italicus", in: J. Irmscher and K. Kumaniecki (eds.) *Aus der altertumswissenschaftlichen Arbeit Volkspolens*, Berlin, 73–80.
——(1974) "Domitian und Martial", *Eos* 62, 105–14.
——(1986) "Martial – eigentlicher Schöpfer und hervorragendster Vertreter des römischen Epigramms", *ANRW* 2.32.4, 2563–623.
Talbert, Richard J. A. (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton.
Tamm, Birgitta (1963) *Auditorium and Palatium. A study on assembly-rooms in Roman palaces during the 1st century B. C. and the 1st century A. D.*, Stockholm.
Tandoi, Vincenzo (1962–63), "Il trionfo di Claudio sulla Britannia e il suo cantore", *SIFC* 34, 137–68.
——(1968) "Giovenale e il mecenatismo a Roma fra I e II secolo, *A&R* 13, 125–45.
——(1969) "Il ricordo di Stazio 'dolce poeta' nella *sat.* VII di Giovenale", *Maia* 21, 103–22.
——(1985) "Per la comprensione del *De bello Germanico* staziano muovendo dalla parodia di Giovenale", in: id. (ed.) *Disiecti membra poetae. Studi di poesia latina in frammenti*, vol. 2, Foggia, 223–34.

——(1988) "L'epigrafe di Faustino a Sperlonga, il ciclo odissiaco del ninfeo e gli inizî di Marziale", in: id. (ed.) *Disiecti membra poetae. Studi di poesia latina in frammenti*, vol. 3, Foggia, 153–79.
Thiele, Georg (1916) "Die Poesie unter Domitian", *Hermes* 51, 233–60.
Thomas, Richard (1983) "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman poetry", *CQ* 33, 92–113.
Thompson, Leonard (1984) "Domitianus dominus: a gloss on Statius *Silvae* 1.6.84", *AJPh* 105, 469–75.
Thomson, D. F. S. (1964) "Interpretations of Catullus – II. Catullus 95.8: 'et laxas scombris saepe dabunt tunicas'", *Phoenix* 18, 30–36.
Thraede, Klaus (1973) "Die Poesie und die Kaiserkult", in: *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain* (*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique* 19), Geneva, 271–303.
Torelli, Mario (1980) *Etruria*, Rome and Bari.
Townend, Gavin B. (1973) "The literary substrata to Juvenal's satires", *JRS* 63, 148–60.
——(1980) "Calpurnius Siculus and the *Munus Neronis*", *JRS* 70, 166–74.
Tränkle, Hermann (1981) "Catullprobleme", *MH* 38, 245–58.
——(1996) "Exegetisches zu Martial", *WS* 109, 133–44.
Treggiari, Susan (1977) "Intellectuals, poets and their patrons in the first century B.C.", *ÉMC* 11, 24–29.
——(1991) *Roman Marriage. Iusti coniuges from the time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*, Oxford.
Valette-Cagnac, Emmanuelle (1997) *La lecture à Rome. Rites et pratiques*, Paris.
Vassileiou, Alain (1983) "Un confrère de Quintilien au Palatin?", in: *Hommages à Jean Cousin*, Paris, 215–23.
——(1984) "Crispinus et les conseillers du prince (Juvénal, *Satires* IV)', *Latomus* 43, 27–68.
Vérilhac, Anne-Marie (1982) *Παῖδες ἄωροι. Poésie funéraire*, 2 vols, Athens.
Versnel, H. S. (1993) *Transition and Reversal in Myth and Ritual* (*Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion* 2) Leiden.
Verstraete, B.C. (1989) "Panegyric and Candour in Statius, *Siluae* 3.4, in: C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 5, Brussels, 405–13.
Vessey, David W. T. C. (1970) "*Non solitis fidibus*: some aspects of Statius, *Silvae* IV,5", *AC* 39, 507–18.
——(1972) "Aspects of Statius' epithalamium", *Mnemosyne* 25, 172–87.
——(1973) *Statius and the Thebaid*, Cambridge.
——(1974a) "Statius to Julius Menecrates (*Silvae*, IV,8)", *AC* 43, 257–66.
——(1974b) "Pliny, Martial and Silius Italicus", *Hermes* 102, 109–16.
——(1981) "Atedius Melior's tree: Statius *Silvae* 2.3", *CPh* 76, 46–52.
——(1983) "*Mediis discumbere in astris*: Statius, *Silvae*, IV,2", *AC* 52, 206–20.
——(1986) "Transience preserved: style and theme in Statius' 'Silvae'", *ANRW* 2.32.5, 2754–802.
Veyne, Paul (1961) "Vie de Trimalcion", *Annales (ESC)* 16, 213–47 = 1991, 13–56.
——(1967) "Autour d'un commentaire de Pline le Jeune", *Latomus* 26, 723–51.
——(1976) *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris.
——(1983) "Le folklore à Rome et les droits de la conscience individuelle", *Latomus* 42, 3–30 = 1991: 57–87.
——(1985) "L'empire romain", in: id. (ed.) *De l'empire romain à l'an mil* (vol. 1 of: Ph. Ariès and G. Duby [eds.] *Histoire de la vie privée*) Paris, 19–223.

——(1991) *La société romaine*, Paris.
Vidman, Ladislaus (1980) *Fasti Ostienses*, 2nd edition, Prague.
Vielberg, Meinolf (1987) *Pflichten, Werte, Ideale. Eine Untersuchung zu den Wertvorstellungen des Tacitus*, Stuttgart.
——(1996) *Untertanentopik. Zur Darstellung der Führungsschichten in der kaiserzeitlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, Munich.
Ville, Georges (1981) *La gladiature en Occident des origines à la mort de Domitien*, Rome.
Vinson, Martha P. (1989) "Domitia Longina, Julia Titi, and the literary tradition", *Historia* 38, 431–50.
Vogt-Spira, Gregor (ed.) (1990) *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur*, Tübingen.
Vollmer, Friedrich (1898) *P. Papinii Statii Silvarum libri herausgegeben und erklärt*, Leipzig.
Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew (1982) "Civilis princeps: between citizen and king", *JRS* 72, 32–48.
——(1983) *Suetonius. The scholar and his Caesars*, London.
——(1989a) "Introduction" to id. (ed.) 1–11.
——(1989b) "Patronage in Roman society: from Republic to Empire", in: id. (ed.) 63–87.
Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew (ed.) (1989) *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London and New York.
Walser, Gerold (1989) "Kaiser Domitian in Mainz", *Chiron* 19, 449–56.
Waltzing, J. P. (1895–1900) *Étude historique sur les corporations professionelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire en Occident*, Louvain (4 vols.).
Waterbury, John (1977) "An attempt to put patrons and clients in their place", in: E. Gellner and id. (eds.) 329–42.
Watson, Lindsay (1998) "Martial 8.21, literary *lusus*, and imperial panegyric", *PLLS* 10, 359–72.
Watson, Patricia (1999) "Martial on the wedding of Stella and Violentilla", *Latomus* 58, 348–56.
Watt, W.S. (1988) "Notes on Statius, Silvae", *WJA* n.s. 14, 159–70.
Weaver, P. R. C. (1965) "The father of Claudius Etruscus. Statius *Silvae* 3.3", *CQ* 15, 145–54.
——(1972) *Familia Caesaris. A social study of the emperor's freedmen and slaves*, Cambridge.
——(1994) "Confusing names: Abascantus and Statius, *Silvae* 5.1", *ÉMC* n.s. 13, 333–64.
Weinreich, Otto (1928) *Studien zu Martial. Literaturhistorische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart.
——(1931) "Zu Babrios 107 und Martial I 20 [misprint for 22]", *Philologus* 86, 270–72 = *Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol. 2, Amsterdam 1973, 391–92.
Weische, Alfons (1989) "Plinius d.J. und Cicero. Untersuchungen zur römischen Epistolographie in Republik und Kaiserzeit", *ANRW* 2.33.1, 375–86.
Weissman, Ronald (1987), "Taking patronage seriously: Mediterranean values and Renaissance society", in: Kent and Simons (eds.) 25–45.
Wendel, Carl (1943) "Der antike Bücherschrank", quoted after the reprint in: id., *Kleine Schriften zum antiken Buch- und Bibliothekwesen* (ed. W. Krieg), Cologne 1974, 64–92.
Wheeler, Arthur Leslie (1930) "Tradition in the epithalamium", *AJPh* 51, 205–31.

——(1934) *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*, Berkeley.
White, Peter (1973a) Summary of *Aspects of Non-Imperial Patronage in the Works of Martial and Statius* (Harvard dissertation, 1972) *HSPh* 77, 258–60. In spite of efforts I could not procure a copy of the dissertation itself.
——(1973b) "Notes on some Statian πρόσωπα", *CPh* 68, 279–84.
——(1973c) "Vibius Maximus, the friend of Statius", *Historia* 22, 292–301.
——(1974) "The presentation and dedication of the *Silvae* and *Epigrams*", *JRS* 64, 40–61.
——(1975) "The friends of Martial, Statius, Pliny, and the dispersal of patronage", *HSPh* 79, 265–300.
——(1978) "*Amicitia* and the profession of poetry in Early Imperial Rome", *JRS* 68, 74–92.
——(1982) "Positions for poets in Early Imperial Rome", in: Gold (ed.) 50–66.
——(1993) *Promised Verse. Poets in the society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, Mass., and London.
——(1996) "Martial and pre-publication texts", *ÉMC* n.s. 15, 397–412.
——(1998) "Latin poets and the *certamen Capitolinum*", in: P. Knox and Cl. Foss (eds.), *Style and Tradition. Studies in honor of Wendell Clausen*, Stuttgart and Leipzig, 84–95.
Wickert, Lothar (1954) "Princeps (civitatis)", *RE* 22, 1998–2296.
Wiedemann, Thomas (1992) *Emperors and Gladiators*, London and New York (paperback edition 1995).
Willenberg, Knud (1973) "Die Priapeen Martials", *Hermes* 101, 320–51.
Williams, Craig A. (1999) *Roman Homosexuality. Ideologies of masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York and Oxford.
Williams, Gareth D. (1992) "Representations of the book-roll in Latin poetry: Ovid, *Tr.* 1,1,3–14 and related texts", *Mnemosyne* 45, 178–89.
Winterbottom, Michael (1964) "Quintilian and the *vir bonus*", *JRS* 54, 90–97.
Winterling, Aloys (1999) *Aula Caesaris. Studien zur Institutionalisierung des römischen Kaiserhofes in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus (31 v. Chr. – 192 n. Chr.)*, Munich.
Wiseman, Timothy Peter (1982a) "*Pete nobiles amicos*: poets and patrons in Late Republican Rome", in: Gold (ed.) 28–49.
——(1982b) "Calpurnius Siculus and the Claudian civil war", *JRS* 72, 57–67.
——(1985) *Catullus and His World. A reappraisal*, Cambridge.
Wissowa, Georg (1909–15) "Saturnus", *ML* 4.427–44.
——(1912) *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd edition, Munich.
Wistrand, Erik (1956) *Die Chronologie der Punica des Silius Italicus*, Göteborg.
Wolf, Eric R. (1966) "Kinship, friendship, and patron-client relations in complex societies", quoted after the reprint in: S. W. Schmidt et al. (eds.) 1977, 167–77.
Wrede, Henning (1981) *Consecratio in formam deorum. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mayence.
Zanker, Paul (1987) *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, Munich (corrected edition 1990).
Zetzel, James E. G. (1982) "The poetics of patronage in the late first century B.C.", in: Gold (ed.) 87–102.
Zevi, Fausto (1979) "Un frammento dei *Fasti Ostienses* e i consolati dei primi anni di Traiano", *PP* 34, 179–201.
Zumthor, Paul (1987) *La lettre et la voix. De la "littérature' médiévale*, Paris.

INDEX OF PASSAGES DISCUSSED

For reasons of space, the footnotes have not been indexed; a few exceptions mainly concern remarks on textual criticism, noted by an asterisk (*). More extensive or systematic discussions are indicated by *italics*.

Literary texts

Anthologia Graeca (see also under the individual poets):
AP (*Anthologia Palatina*):
6.322: 187, n.135
6.325: 255, n.12
6.328: 91, n.2
6.329: 106
9.93: 106
9.572: 91, n.2
11.10: 98; 100, n.36
Antipater of Thessalonica:
31 *GP*: 106
Apuleius:
Apol. (*Apology*):
10: 84, n.163
11: 70
Met. (*Metamorphoses*):
1.1.1: 137
Athenaeus:
15.677d–e: 8
Aurelius Victor
Caes. (*De Caesaribus*)
14.2–3: 7–8

Cassius Dio: see Dio Cassius
Catullus:
1: 109–10
2–3: 156–57, n.40
3: 257
61: 265
Cicero:
De Orat. (*De Oratore*):
2.239, 444–89: 177–78

Dio Cassius:
59.25.4: 414
60.20.3–4: 215, *215, n.76
66.3.4, 9.4: 202
67.2.1: 337
67.2.3: 428
67.3.2: 435
67.4.2: 414
67.10.1–2: 232
67.12.1:433
67.12.5: 416
Dio Chrysostom:
1.46: 333
6.59: 414
Dionysius of Halicarnassus:
2.9–11: 13

Firmicus Maternus:
Mathesis:
8.33.4: 123
Florus:
Verg. (*Vergilius Orator an Poeta*):
1.3–7: 330–31
1.4: 306; 335
1.8–9: 334

Galen:
Libr. Ord. (*De Ordine Librorum Suorum*):
19.51 K. = 2.81 M.: 123–24
Libr. Propr. (*De Libris Propriis*):
19.8–9 K. = 2.91 M.: 140
Gellius:
*pr.*6: 253–54
4.7: 214

Historia Augusta:
Pert. (*Pertinax*):
11.6: 393
Homer:
Od. (*Odyssey*):
8.72–82: 359
Horace:
C. (*Odes*):
1.1.1–2: 60

1.3: 274
3.30: 424
Ep. (*Epistles*):
1.15.26–41: 178
S. (*Satires*):
1.3.21: 179
1.5: 75
1.5.50–70: 178

Justinian:
Inst. (*Institutiones*):
4.18.4: 298–99
Juvenal:
1.33: 16
1.95–126: 56–57
1.99–116: 21
1.170–71: 2
2.29–33: 433–34
3.57: 16
4.20: 16
4.69–71: *419–21*
5: 173–74
5.3–4: 178–79
5.12–18: *17*
5.146: 15
6.313: 16
7.1–97: *1–10*
7.2: 7; 9
7.18: 7
7.37: 9
7.45–47: 9
7.74–78: 14–15
7.82–87: 202
7.82–92: *3–5*
7.186–88: 4
7.215–43: 8
7.215–19: 4
9.10: 176
10.46: 16
14.192: 72

Largus: see Scribonius Largus
Laus Pisonis:
41–42: 83, n.161; 149, n.21
118: 15
230–37: 83, n.161
Leonides of Alexandria:
2 *FGE*: 187, n. 135
4 *FGE*: 255, n.12
7 *FGE*: 91, n.2
8 *FGE*: 106

Lucian:
Ep. Sat. (*Epistulae Saturnales*):
19–39: 185–88
34: 175–76
Merc. Cond. (*De Mercede Conductis*):
30: 176
Sat. (*Saturnalia*):
1–18: 184–188
10–18: 172–73
10: 186
13: 188
15–16: 186–187
Lucillius:
AP 9.572: 91, n.2
AP 11.10: 98
AP 11.137: 98

Martial:
1.*ep.*: *43*; *113–14*; 168; 311
1.1: 132, n.131
1.2: 122
1.3: 132, n.131; 376
1.4: 168; 376; 379; 432
1.4–5: 365; 366; 385
1.5: 379
1.6, 14, 22, 48, 51, 60, 104: *368–70*; *408–12*
1.6: 380–381; 411
1.7: 156–57, n.40; 211; 298
1.12: *152*; 154; 164
1.14: 408
1.20: 174
1.22: 408–09
1.25: 162
1.31: 71
1.41: 179; 411
1.44: *368–370*; 411
1.45: *369–370*
1.48: 409
1.49: 65, n.83
1.51: 409
1.59: 163; 311
1.61: 60
1.66: 134
1.76: *60*
1.82: *152*; 154; 164
1.101: *53*; 130; 366
1.104: 409–10
1.107: *82–83*; 85
1.108: 65, n.83

(Martial)
1.111: 78; 154
1.113: 122
1.114–116: 162; 164
1.117: 122; 134
1.118: 118
2.*ep.*: *114*; 282
2.1: *93*; 130
2.2: 385
2.6: *92–93*; 139–40
2.14: 311
2.18: 56
2.69: 227
2.88: *94*
2.90–91: 54, n.46
2.91–92: 336–37; 367–68; 385
2.91.3: *367, n.38
2.93: 118–19; 155
3.1–5: 117; 377
3.2: 110; 162
3.6: 165
3.20: 311
3.25: 163
3.37: 16
3.38: 5
3.39: 163
3.41 (40): 16
3.45: 98
3.47: 162
3.50: 98
3.58: 162
3.92: 65, n.83
3.94: *42*
3.95: 5; *53–54*; 132; 336–37
4.1–3: 117; 129; 329
4.1: 333
4.8: 168; 345; 364–66
4.10: *109*; 129–30; 162
4.11: 111
4.14: *64*; *110–11*; 149; 187
4.27: 337
4.30: 388
4.35: 363
4.40: *86–87*; 225
4.44: 388
4.45: 165
4.54: 227
4.55: 65, n.83
4.57: 162; 388
4.61: 81–82
4.63: 388
4.64: 73
4.72: 122
4.73: 229
4.74: 364
4.76: 81
4.79: *51*
4.82: 75; *111–12*
4.86: *112*; 161
4.89: 117
5.1–2: 117; 337
5.1: 365; 376
5.2: 167; 376; 432
5.4: 65
5.5: 134–35; 202; 327; 343; 365; 386
5.6: *340*; 345; 365–66; 386
5.8, 14, 23, 25, 27, 35, 38, 41: 372
5.10: 152; 154
5.11–12: 158
5.13: 54; 132; 431
5.15: *142*; 167; 337–38
5.16: 85; 132; 138–39
5.17: 54
5.18: 16; 79; 187
5.19: 338
5.20: *72–73*
5.21: 153; 154
5.22: 50
5.30: 187
5.32: 163
5.34: 37
5.36: *142*
5.48: 71
5.51: 45–47
5.56: 6
5.59: *78–79*
5.63: 153
5.64: 148
5.71: 162
5.72: 45–47
5.78: 115
5.80: *126–28*
5.82: 81
6.1–4: 117
6.1: *125*; 365; 430
6.2, 4, 6, 22, 45, 91: 172; *430–36*
6.2: 430
6.3: *434–36*
6.4: 430

6.6: 431
6.7: 163; 431
6.8: 6
6.10: *338*; 341
6.12: 65
6.13: 302
6.16: 52
6.21: 88; 156; 164; *297*
6.22: *299–300*; 431
6.24: *169–70*
6.28–29: 88; 227; 260
6.28.314
6.31: 431
6.38: 153
6.39: 431
6.42: 89; 103; 229; 247; 256; 294; *311*
6.44: 176–77
6.44.3: *176, n.100
6.45: 431–32
6.53: 163
6.58: 71
6.64: *61–62*
6.67: 431–32
6.76: 66, n.89
6.83: 229; 233
6.87: *339*
6.89: 45–47
6.90: 431
6.91: 431
7.1–2, 5–8: 117; 129; 372
7.12: 162
7.14: 211; 297
7.16: *155*
7.17: 73
7.21–23: 89; 165; 225
7.24: 5
7.26: *130, n.126; 161
7.27: 80
7.28: 65; 187
7.29: 70
7.31: 78; 154
7.32: 65, n.83
7.36: 80; *155*
7.40: 215; 229; 230
7.44–45: 104
7.47: 62
7.51–52: 138
7.56: 393
7.60: *338*
7.63: 149–150; 153
7.68: 41
7.72: 16; 65
7.79: 336
7.88: 132
7.89: *160–61*; 164
7.91: 78
7.92: 154
7.93: 71
7.97: *131*–132; 139
7.99: 118; 344; 365; 366
8.*ep*.1: *114*; 117; 365; 376; 432
8.*ep*.3–5: 378; 385
8.*ep*.5–6: 386
8.*ep*.9–10: 413
8.1: 365
8.2, 4, etc.: 372–74
8.2: 353
8.3: 182
8.20: *94*
8.22: 49
8.23: 42
8.24: *338–39*
8.28: 54; 80; 346; 386
8.36: 393
8.38: 227; 314
8.39: 394
8.45: 69; 75; 104; 163
8.46: 47; 101–02
8.49 (50): 364
8.50 (51): 41; *47*; 80; *101–02*
8.52: 47–48
8.55 (56): 60; *83–85*; 163
8.66: 150
8.68: 346, n.77
8.70: 437
8.72: 130
8.73: 41; 85
8.76: *49*
8.78: 156; 212
8.82: 327; *339–40*; 365–66
9. *ep*., *dedic*: 41; 65, n.83; *114–15*
9.1, 3, etc. : 129
9.1, 20, 34: 373
9.2: 15
9.3, 5 (6): 117
9.3: 333
9.5 (6), 7 (8): 429
9.11–13, 16–17, 36: 89; *426–30*
9.18: *52*, 337
9.26: 437–39

(Martial)
9.28: 168
9.36: 348; 426; 428–29
9.39: 165
9.42: 156
9.43–44: 75–76; 89; *102–03*; 228; 257; 294; 321–22
9.43.1: *76, n.133
9.49: 54; 80; 346
9.55: 156
9.64, 65, 101: 374
9.72: 80
9.74: 76; 104
9.79: 348
9.81: 138
9.84: 66, n.90; *77–78*; 140
9.85: 46
9.86: 41; 74; 150; 164
9.88: *42*
9.89: 87; *100*
9.89.2: *100
9.90: 69; 163
9.91: 393
9.93: 101
9.95–95b: *44–45*
9.95b.1: *44, n.18
9.97: 177
9.99: 64–65, nn.82–83; *82*
9.103: 66, n.91
10.1–7: 117–18
10.4: 182
10.6: 377; 440
10.7: 440
10.10: 56
10.12: *159–60*; 161; 164
10.18 (17): 65, n.83; 87; 187
10.20 (19): *37–39*; 145; 153; 168; 345
10.28: 353–54
10.30: 161
10.33: 44; 65, n.83
10.34: 440
10.35: 38
10.48: *58–61*; 70; 168
10.51: 68; 162
10.51.5: *68, n.98
10.58: 55–56; 75
10.64: 87; 225
10.70: 16; 56–57
10.72: 377; *382–83*; 437; 440
10.73: 64–65, n.82; 80; *82*
10.76: 6
10.78: 65, n.83
10.87: *106*; 167
10.93: 130–31
10.96: *57*
10.101: 179
10.103–04: 91–92, n.3; 118, n.91
11.1–7: 437–38
11.1–2: 117–18
11.1: 140
11.2: 169; 377; 437
11.3: 85; *133*
11.6: 101
11.7: 433
11.11: 101
11.13: 5
11.15: 161
11.21: 438
11.26: 101
11.36: 101
11.42: 88
11.47–51: 166
11.48: 40; 150
11.50 (49): 40; 150
11.52: 311
11.57: 41
11.59: 158
11.80: 163
11.88: 46
11.106: 66, n.92; *119–20*
11.107–08: 118–20
12.*ep.*: 88–89; *115–16*; *125–26*; 138
12.1–5: 118
12.1: *115–16*; 126
12.2 (3): 89–90; 116; 131–32; 135; 140; 156
12.3 (4 + 6.7–12): 69; 80; *85*; 126; 143; 377
12.5 (2 + 6.1–6): *439–40*
12.5.4 (6.2): *439, n.196
12.8–9: 440
12.11: 346
12.14: 126
12.18: 5;
12.24: 89
12.29 (26): 54–57
12.31: 80
12.36: *86–87*
12.36.10: *86, n.167

12.57: 165
12.62: 126
12.67: *40*; 150
12.74: 78
12.95: 41; 74; 166
12.98: 41; 165
13: 186–87
13.3: 122; 134
13.4: 376
13.127: 376
14: 186–87
14.60: 311
14.183–96: 187
Sp. (*Liber spectaculorum*):
6 (5): 406
12 (10): 406–07
20 (17): 406
31 (27 [29]): 407
35 (31 [32]): 367–68
Xenia: see *Epigrams* 13
Apophoreta: see *Epigrams* 14
Menander Rhetor:
421.32–422.2: 275
435.9–14: 275
435.20–21: 275

Nepos:
Att.: 310

Ovid:
Am. (*Amores*):
1.6: 300
2.6: 257
2.11: 274
Fast. (*Fasti*):
3.330: 425
Met. (*Metamorphoses*):
15.871–79: 424
Pont. (*Epistulae ex Ponto*):
1.1.1–12: 288
Tr. (*Tristia*):
2.488–91: 172
3.1.59–72: 135
3.5.33–34: 409

Petronius:
55.2–4: 99
84.1–2: 28
Pliny the Elder:
Nat. (*Naturalis Historia*):
pr.5: 327

Pliny the Younger:
Ep. (*Letters*):
1.1: 129
1.5.2–3: 151
1.5.11: 153
1.8: 328
1.9.6: 315
1.13.6: 24–25
2.1.2: 143
2.6: 173
2.6.2: 15
2.20.7–8: 314
3.7: 63; *148–50*
3.7.8: 40
3.7.14: 144–45
3.10: 124
3.13: 124
3.20.12: 144
3.21: *37–39*; 78; *142–43*
3.21.1: 149
3.21.5: 48
4.2: 154
4.7: 154
4.7.4: 153
4.7.5: 153
4.8.4: 145
4.13: 328
4.18.4: 95
4.27: 95; 147
5.3: 96
5.10: 147
6.2.2–3: 152–54
6.21.5–6: 43
7.21.1: 137
8.9: 315
8.12.2, 6: 25
9.2.2–3: 146
9.11.2: 132
9.14: 149
9.17: 97
9.17.1–2: 177–78
9.25.3: *157*; 211
Pan. (*Panegyricus Traiani*):
2.3: 382–83; 413
2.7: 412
3.2–5: 412–13
11.1: 382
49.1: 382
49.5–8: 395–96
53: 382
54.1–4: 440

(Pliny, *Panegyricus*)
74.3: 414
78.2: 382
88.1–2: 347–48
Plutarch:
Aud. Poet. (*De Audiendis Poetis*):
15d: 320
Quaest. Conv. (*Quaestiones Convivales*):
1.1: 176
1.2: 174, n.97
1.4: 171
2.1: 98; 176
5.5: 174, n.97
7.8: 97–98

Quintilian:
Inst. (*Institutio Oratoria*):
ep.: 122, n.103; 128
1.*pr.*6: 128; *213, n.70; 214
3.7.4: 331
3.7.10–18: 275
4.*pr.*1: 128; *213, n.70; 214
5.13.9: 299
6.*pr.*1: *213, n.70
6.3.27–35, 45–102: 177–78
8.6.46–47: 84
9.2.64–75: *416–18*
9.2.67: 417
10.1.91–92: 327
10.3.17: 252
10.7.19: 99
12.1.1: 153
12.11.13: *213, n.70

Scribonius Largus:
ep. 13: 343
Scriptores Historiae Augustae: see *Historia Augusta*
Seneca:
Ben. (*De Beneficiis*):
1.1–3: 24
1.4.5: 24
2.18.5: 25
2.23.3: 15, n.44
4.21.1: 25
6.33.4–34.2: 15
Brev. Vit. (*De Brevitate Vitae*):
(*Dial.* 10.)7.7: 16
Cl. (*De Clementia*):
1.5.5: 409
Ep. (*Letters to Lucilius*):
55: 316
Ot. (*De Otio*)
(*Dial.* 8.)3.4: 316
Plb. (*Consolatio ad Polybium*):
(*Dial.* 11.)6.5: 343
Servius:
Commentary on Virgil:
A. 8.9: 232
Silius Italicus:
3.594–629: 149, n.19
3.619–21: 327
14.686–88: 149, n.19
Statius:
Ach. (*Achilleid*):
1.15–16: 327
Silv. (*Silvae*):
1.*ep.*1–15: *249–252*; *280–81*; 287; 356; 362
1.*ep.*4: *249, n.1
1.ep.5: *281, n.88
1.*ep.*16–20: 253; 266; 279; *350–351*; 361; 375; 422
1.*ep.*19: **350–51*
1.*ep.*20–23: 88; 245; 251; 269
1.*ep.*23–26: 239
1.*ep.*27–28: 207; 253; 280
1.*ep.*29–30: 89; 103; 240; 256; 279
1.*ep.*30–32: 362
1.*ep.*32: *362, n.20
1.1: 266; 362; *422–26*
1.1.56–58: 424–25
1.2: 223; *262–266*; *295–301*
1.2.*tit.*: 269–71
1.2.16–17: 263
1.2.24–26: 263
1.2.26–30: 296–97
1.2.46–50: 264
1.2.174–81: 156
1.2.197–99: *157, n.41
1.2.241–42: 264
1.2.256: 205
1.2.257–59: 236
1.3: *226*; 239
1.3.90–93: 316–17
1.3.91: 309
1.3.93–94: 320
1.3.99–104: 320
1.3.108–09: 309
1.4: *206–10*; 268–69; 274

1.4.*tit.*: 269–71
1.4.34–36: 244; 268
1.4.80–83: 208–09
1.4.117–20: 236
1.4.127–31: 271
1.4.127: 203
1.5: 229; *310–12*
1.5.*tit.*: 311
1.5.9: 240
1.5.35: 103; 247
1.5.65: 231; 312
1.6: *396–402*
1.6.1–8: 397–98
1.6.8: *398, n.64
1.6.35–36: 401
1.6.39–48: 399–400
2.*ep.*1–9: 88; 227; 239; 244; 250; 280; 283; 287
2.*ep.*9–12: 88; 251; 269; 279; 283
2.*ep.*12–14: 205; 238; 250
2.*ep.*14–18: 250–51; 257; 279; 313; 351; 361; 402
2.*ep.*18–22: 239; 242; 251; 269; *362–62*
2.*ep.*19: *228, n.125
2.*ep.*22–24: 89; 241; 245
2.*ep.*24: *89, n.176; *241, n.157
2.*ep.*27–29: *282–83*
2.1: 228; *259–61*; 304–05
2.1.17–18: 259–60
2.1.30–34: 259; 285
2.1.124–25: 314
2.1.183–207: 262
2.1.191–207: 314
2.2: 203; *222–225*; *317–20*; 426
2.2.26–29: 318–19
2.2.64–69: 309
2.2.71: 321
2.2.131–32: 319
2.2.133–42: 309
2.2.137: *317, n.92
2.2.140: 309
2.2.151–54: 224
2.3: 254; *312–15*
2.3.14–16: 260
2.3.62–63: 244; 254–55
2.3.64–71: 312–13; 316–17
2.4: 239; *257–59*
2.4.4–7: 258
2.4.4: *258, n.21
2.4.8–9: 262
2.5: *402–404*
2.5.5: 408
2.6: 228; 239; 261; 275; 304–05
2.6.*tit.*: 269–71
2.6.80–81: 262
2.6.96: *228, n.126
2.7: 268
2.7.*tit.*: 269–72
2.7.72: 255
2.7.86: 70
2.7.124–27: 302
2.7.128–34: 225
3.*ep.*1–8: 223; 238; *250–51*; 254; 288; 309
3.*ep.*9–10: 244; 250; 257
3.*ep.*11–14: 213; 244; 270
3.*ep.*14–15: 245
3.*ep.*16–20: 89; 234; 245; 250; 348
3.*ep.*20–23: 195
3.*ep.*23–24: 316
3.1: 222–223; 335
3.1.25: 321
3.1.61–64: 202; 335
3.1.166: 320
3.2: *213*; *237*; 267; 274; *292–93*
3.2.*tit.*: 269–72
3.2.127–28: 301
3.2.131–33: 267–68
3.3: *229–233*; 262; *303–04*
3.3.*tit.*: 269
3.3.32–33: 244
3.3.37–39: 255
3.3.128–30: 289
3.3.134: *230, n.134
3.3.158: 381
3.3.205–07: 262
3.4: 234; 268; *426–29*
3.4.50–55: 304
3.5: 195
3.5.31–33: 197; 335
3.5.35–36: 196
3.5.50–54: 225
3.5.85–86: 316
4.*ep.*1–5: 280; *286–87*; 376
4.*ep.*4: *287, n.111
4.*ep.*5–8: 271; 352; 396
4.*ep.*8–10: 278
4.*ep.*10–13: 214; 218
4.*ep.*13–15: 240; 243; 321

(Statius, *Silvae*)
4.*ep*.15–19: 220–21; 235; 238; 282
4.*ep*.19–24: 217; 221; 235; 238; 251; 279; 287
4.*ep*.24–34: 250; 254; 279; 356; 365; 374; 375
4.*ep*.34–35: 214; *283–84*, *283–84, nn. 99–100
4.1: *352–355*; 357–58
4.1.13–15: 354
4.2: 335–36; 358–359; *392–96*
4.2.*tit*.: 269, n.47; 270–71
4.2.10–12: 392–93
4.2.14–17: 394–95
4.2.22: *394, n.54
4.2.62: 333
4.2.63–68: 386
4.2.65–67: 196; 329–30
4.3: *359–361*; *388–93*
4.3.4–6: 306; 352
4.3.9–10: 353
4.3.11–16: 429
4.3.81–84: 389
4.3.149–52: 426
4.3.149: 426
4.3.153–63: 391
4.4: *213–16*; 237
4.4.*tit*.: 278
4.4.33–34: 315–16
4.4.61–69: 301
4.4.69–75: 214–15; 316
4.4.70–73: 301
4.4.93–94: 203
4.5: *218–220*; *306–07*
4.5.1–22: 202
4.5.3–4: 278
4.5.25: 238
4.5.49–60: 309
4.6: *228–229*; 256–257; 321–23
4.6.*tit*.: 321
4.6.1–34: 89; 103
4.6.12: 240
4.6.75–84: 306
4.6.90–93: 322
4.6.91–92: 317
4.6.96: 309
4.7: *220–221*; 246
4.7.21–24: 203–04; 238
4.7.25: 238
4.7.49–50: 381
4.8: *221–222*
4.8.13: 223
4.8.33: 205; 238
4.8.38–40: 246
4.8.39: 202
4.8.40: *246, n.166
4.8.59–62: 217; 301
4.9: 205; *217–218*; 238; *240–241*
4.9.17–19: 217–18
4.9.54–55: 278
5.1: *233–34*; 247; 262; *301–03*
5.1.*ep*.: 193–94; 247
5.1.*tit*.: 269–71
5.1.12–13: 255
5.2: *216–217*; 237; 268; *307–08*
5.2.*tit*.: *216, n.81
5.2.5: 205
5.3: *195–202*; 285
5.3.*tit*.: 269–71
5.3.116–20: 198–99
5.3.119: *199, n.19
5.3.178–80: 200–01
5.3.182–83: *200, n.27
5.3.215–24: 203
5.3.225–33: 196–98; 335
5.4: 195
5.5: 195; 304–05
5.5.*tit*.: 269–71
5.5.36–37: 203
5.5.56–65: 305
Theb. (*Thebaid*):
12.811–12: 196
Suetonius:
Aug. (*Augustus*):
26.2: 353
89.1: 99
98.4: 99
Dom. (*Domitianus*):
2.2: 327
4.5: 401
7.2: 301
8.3: 43; 427
10.1, 4: 416
10.2: 315
10.5: 385
13.1: 402
15.1: 353
20: 327
21: 395
22: 435

Tacitus:
Ann. (*Annals*)
3.55: 158
13.3.1: 415
13.22.1: 212
13.48: 318
14.11.3: 436
16.32: 16
Dial. (*Dialogus de Oratoribus*):
6.6: 251
9.3: 9
38.2: 145
Hist. (*Histories*):
2.86.3: *308, n.63
3.74.1: 331–32
4.42.1: 151; *151, n.23
4.86.2: 327
Theocritus:
16: 30
17.114: 16

Vacca:
Vit. Luc. (*Life of Lucan*):
78.15 Reiff.: 253
Valerius Flaccus:
1.12–14: 327
Virgil:
A. (*Aeneid*):
1.740–47: 359
6.791–805: 390
Ecl. (*Bucolics*):
4: 390
9: 84
9.11–13: 157

Inscriptions

AE:
1979, 648–49: 210

CFA:
62a.73: 213
68–69, 71, 74–75: 215
CIL:
3.14112.2: 230
16.23: 210

CLE:
1787: 289

FO[2] (cited by year):
97: 160
105: 213
146: 197, n.12

I. Eph.:
3.715: *208*
IG[2]:
2.3919: 199
IGUR:
3.1336: *332–34*
ILS:
971: 215
1025: 213
1044: 226
5178: 335
6509: 232
8761: 172
9052: 210
9499: *208*
IRT:
412: 219

GENERAL INDEX

a studiis: 342–44
Abascantus (see also Priscilla):
  as patron of Statius: 193–94; 233–34; 240; 247
  funeral monument for wife: 302
  identity: 302, n.38
  position threatened: 301–02
  Statius' defensive strategy: 302
acquisitive activities: see commerce
adulatio: see flattery
Aelianus: see Roscius Aelianus
aetiology: 264
affection: 15; 22–23; 73; 235; 237
Africans, attitudes towards: 306–07
agones: see games
Ahl, Frederick M.: 11; 421–27
Alexandria, Museum: 8–9
Alexis (in Virgil): 84–85
amici principis: 344
amicitia:
  as context for poetry: 30–31; 235
  friendship and patronage: 14–18
  reciprocity in: 23–25
  vocabulary of:
    in Juvenal: 14–17
    in Martial: 15–16; 18; 74–76
    in Pliny: 37–39; 173–74
    in Statius: 193–94; 204–05; 237–40
amphitheatre (Colosseum):
  acoustics: 362
  "fatal charades": 405–06
  gladiators: 407–08
  inauguration: 397; 405
  Kalendae Decembres: 396–402
  naumachies: 406
  seating arrangements: 400–02
  symbolism: 403–10
  tamed lions (see also Martial – cycles): 402–04; 408–10
Antistius Rusticus: 70
Antonius Primus:
  as patron of Martial: 64; 74, n.124; 80; 82
  identity: 64–65, n.82
Antonius Saturninus, revolt of: 66; 111; 384–85
Apollo, temple of (on the Palatine): 9
apostrophe: 42; 358–59
Aquillius Regulus: see Regulus
Arcanus: 130
architecture (explicated in poetry): 319; 354; 389–90; 393; 402
Argentaria Polla (widow of Lucan):
  as patron of Martial: 70; 87; 89; 165; 225
  as patron of Statius: 89; 223–25; 239; 241–42
  celebrates Lucan's birthday: 89; 225
  identical with Polla, wife of Pollius?: 223–25
"aristocracy": 25, n.82
Arruntius Stella: see Stella
Arulenus Rusticus: 151
Asinius Pollio: 84
asymmetry: see patronage
Atedius Melior:
  as patron of Martial: 68; 88
  as patron of Statius: 88; 226–27; 239; 242–43; 244
  dedicatee of *Silv*. 2: 282–83
  involvement in politics?: 313–17
  quies: 227; 312; 316
  Statius on death of *puer*: 304–05
  Statius on tree: 313–14
Athenaeum: 7–9
Atticus (friend of Cicero):
  and *quies*: 310
  published Cicero's works: 122
Atticus (in Martial): 83, n.65
auditor: 138
auditoria: 95
Augustus:
  and *scurrae*: 178–79
  and *lex Julia*: 430–33
  example for Domitian: 352–53; 390–91; 400–01; 432
  example for Nerva: 437
  improvises in Greek: 99

Avitus (see also Stertinius Avitus):
identity: 41; 83, n.65
in isolated vocative: 46

Bakhtin, Mikhail M.: 180–84
Bartsch, Shadi: 412–16
baths: 311
beneficia: 23–25
Bilbilis: see Martial
birthdays (see also *genethliacon*):
gifts (of poetry) at: 105–07; 164–65; 254–55; 365
of deceased persons: 89; 225; 314–315
Blaesus (friend of Melior): 314–15
Boissevain, Jeremy: 18; 22
book-keeping vocabulary: see patronage
books (see also dedication; *libelli*; libraries; prefaces; presentation poems; publication; readership):
as gifts: 107–13; 121–31; 186–87
beginnings: 113–118; 129; 287; 375–77
ends: 118–20
exterior described: 109; 130–31
in codex form: 122; 441
layout: 114–15
numbered: 91, n.2; 114; 117; 119, n.93; 125; 365
order of poems in: 113; 118
prices of: 134
time needed for reading: 93; 116; 127
booksellers: 121–22; 132; 140
brokerage: see patronage

Caecilianus: 88
Caecilius Secundus: 76–77, n.136
Caesius Sabinus: 72, n.116; 131; 139
Caesonius or Caesennius Maximus: 71
Cairns, Francis: 272–74
Callistus: see Julius Callistus
Calpurnius Piso (conspirator):
addressee of *Laus Pisonis*: 83, n.161; 86, n.169
as patron of Martial: 86
Calpurnius Piso (in Pliny): 146–47
Calpurnius Siculus, date: 83, n.161
Camonius Rufus: 41; 104
Campania (see also Naples; Pollius Felix; Puteoli; villas): 318–19; 388–89
and Epicureanism: 318, n.95
and subjugation of nature: 318–20
oratorical traditions in: 276–77
Canius Rufus: 41; 47, n.27; 59
cantare: 138–39
carnival, carnivalisation (see also Saturnalia): 180–84
Cassius Dio: see Dio Cassius
castration edict of Domitian: 428–32
Castricus: 46; 68–69
Catullus (see also Martial; Stella; Statius)
epithalamium: 265
publication: 109–10
Saturnalian poetry: 205
cena:
and Saturnalia: 166–73
as context for improvisation: 87–88; 99–100
as context for Martial's epigrams: 96–105; 139
as context for mockery: 98; 174–79
as context for recitation: 92–93; 97–105
criticism of guests and hosts at: 42; 101; 174–79
emperors at: 395–96
entertainments at: 97
ideology of: 171; 173; 175; 396
(in)equality at: 173–75; 401–02
"kings" at: 171–72
"laws" at: 99; 172–73
censorship (of publications): 374
centumviral court: 145; 149–50; 153
centurions: 71–72; 133; 136
Cicero (see also Pliny):
on friendship and reciprocity: 23
on humour and mockery: 177–78
on publication and dedication: 122; 128
Citroni, Mario: 441–42
ciuilitas of emperor: 396: 402; 404
Claudia (wife of Statius): 193–96
Claudius (emperor): 347; 414–15
Claudius Etruscus:
and father's exile: 233; 311–12
as patron of Martial: 68; 89

(Claudius Etruscus)
as patron of Statius: 89; 229; 240; 244–45
baths: 103; 246–47; 256; 311
father: see Julius Phaon (?)
Claudius Livianus: 66
Clemens (in Martial): 130
Clemens, Flavius: 352–53
clementia: 410; 413; 439
cliens:
avoided: 15
counterpart of *patronus*: 12
equivalent of *amicus*: 15; 17
clientage: see patronage
clients (see also *salutatio*; *sportula*):
life of: 13–17
senators and knights as: 56–56
Clodius Crispinus: see Crispinus (son of Vettius Bolanus)
closure: 118–20
codices: see books
Coleman, Kathleen M.: 11; 374; 443
collections: see books; *libelli*
collegium poetarum: 9, n.29; 314, n.82
Colosseum: see amphitheatre
commerce: 21; 59–60; 68; 162–63; 223; 310–11
commissions: see patronage (literary) – initiative
communication (see also speech acts):
"enhanced": 163
fictional and real: 42–43; 48–49; 55
literary: 31–32, 48; 235; 245; 277
represented in poetry: 154; 159; 162–66
community, literary: 31
companionship of poets: 75
comparisons, interpretation of: 425–26
consolation (see also *epicedion*):
poetic tradition of: 275
public: 275–76
rhetorical rules for: 275
Silv. 2.5 as: 404
context of utterance (see also deixis): 49; 258–69; 356–57
continere: 157–58, n.43; 279–80
copyright, absence of: 121
Cornelius Fuscus: 66, n.89
Cornelius Priscus: 38
correction, requests for: 124–28
Crispinus (courtier): 66–67; 344
Crispinus (son of Vettius Bolanus):
as patron of Statius: 216–17; 237–38
identity: 216
Statius' apologetic strategy: 307
cupbearers (see also Earinus): 47; 101–02
cycles: see Martial

dare:
in patronage: 142; 338–39; 379
of poems and books: 122–24; 279; 341; 365
Decianus: 65; 74, n.124; 114
declamation: 416–18
dedication: 120–131
as publication: 122–28; 282–84; 288; 367–68
by address: 128
by giving: 122–24
by privileged position in book: 128, n.122; 129
by request for correction: 124–28
multiple: 129–30; 376
of copy and of work: 120–21
of poems and books: 46–47; 128–29; 376
to emperor: 375–76
deixis (see also mimetic technique):
as sign of occasional character: 258; 356–67
fictional: 258–69; 357–64
Demetrius (slave/ freedman of Martial): 53; 366–67
Dio Cassius
on Domitian's hypocrisy: 428; 433
on praising emperors: 414
Dio Chrysostom: 333; 414
Dionysius of Halicarnassus (pseudo-): see rhetoric
diues: 54; 73; 187; 203
Domitian (see also Amphitheatrum Flavium; Domus Flavia; flattery; imperial cult; praise; Via Domitiana):
adoption of sons: 352–53
and Earinus: 427–28
and Julia: 433–36
and Jupiter: 201–02; 331–33; 338; 358; 380–81; 391–94; 400
and Minerva: 329; 333–34

as corrector of morals: 432
as dedicatee: 114; 129; 376; 385–86
as *dominus* (*et deus*): 382–83; 401–02
as patron of Martial: 336–40; 379
as patron of Statius: 335–36
as poet: 202; 327
at beginning of books: 114; 117–18; 129; 287; 375–77
attitude towards (after death): 330–31; 382–83; 395–96
behaviour at meals: 395–96
censor (*perpetuus*): 441, n.2
compared to Julius Caesar: 423–25
criticised by poets?: 411–37
distribution of poems about: 385–86
equestrian statue of: 422–25; 438
Germanicus: 441, n.1
initiative: 349–55
negotiations with Martial and Statius: 350; 354; 378; 385–87
numen honoured by animals: 406; 410; 419–20
pupil of Statius' father?: 200–01
reads Martial: 341
revives Augustan legislation: 400–01; 432
triumph over Chatti and Dacians:
celebrated with games: 211–12
hardly present in Martial: 386
in coinage: 381
sang by Statius: 196; 330; 359
victory over Sarmatians:
celebrated with banquets: 364
celebrated with games: 212
in Martial: 372–74; 386–87
Domitius Apollinaris:
as patron of Martial: 64; 74, n.124
career not mentioned: 159–61
dedicatee: 112; 161
protection against criticism requested: 112; 161; 284
villa praised: 161
Domitius Lucanus: 64; 92; 151, n.25
Domitius Marsus: 6–7, n.20; 84–85; 135
Domitius Tullus: 64; 92; 151, n.25
Domus Flavia: 392–95
Du Quesnay, Ian M. Le M.: 274
duration: see patronage
Earinus (cupbearer of Domitian):
and Domitian: 427–28
and Martial: 89
and Statius: 89; 234–35; 240
dedication of locks: 429–30
ecphrasis: 102–04
edere, *emittere*, ἐκδιδόναι: 121–24
emperor: see under individual emperors
emperor cult: see imperial cult
emphasis: see *figura*
Entellus (*a libellis*): 67
epicedion (see also consolation; rhetoric):
and *consolatio*: 269, n.46
mimetic technique in: 260–62
terminology: 269–71
Epicureanism:
and Hercules: 320–21
and *quies*: 318–19
in Atticus: 310
in Manilius Vopiscus: 316–17; 320
in Pollius Felix: 318–21
epigrams (see also books; *libelli*):
as gifts: 105–07
as *ioci*: 110; 167–69
function before publication: 91–105
funerary: 105
hendecasyllables as: 95–96
improvised: 99–100
isopsephic: 106
pairs of: 103–04
recited: 95–96
skoptic: 42–44; 98–99
sympotic: 100–04
epithalamium:
mimetic technique in: 262–66
terminology: 265; 269–71
equestrian addressees:
in Martial: 66–67
in Statius: 218–22
equestrian census: 55; 81
eucharisticon: 269–71
Eumolpus (in Petronius): 28
eunuchs: see castration edict
Euphemus (*tricliniarcha*): 67; 345; 364
evergetism (see also patronage – community patronage): 387–88
exchange: see *amicitia* – reciprocity; patronage – reciprocity

fame: 27; 33–34; 37–39; 142–48
familiaris: see *amicitia* – vocabulary of
Faustinus:
as dedicatee of Martial: 109–10; 117; 129–30
as patron of Martial: 51; 67–68; 74, n.124; 92
identity: 67–68; 162
in isolated vocative: 46; 163; 372
support in literary controversies requested: 162–63
villas praised: 162
fiction: see deixis – fictional; Martial – addressees; Martial – "I"
figura: 416–18
Finley, Moses I.: 328
Flaccus
as patron of Martial: 59–61; 74, n.124; 78–79; 83; 92
identity: 59–60; 69
in isolated vocative: 46; 163–64
receives no panegyric: 163
flattery (see also praise; sincerity): 382–83; 414–15; 419–21
Flavia, Flavius: see for members of the dynasty and the *familia Caesaris* under their usual names
Flavius Ursus:
as patron of Statius: 228; 239; 242–43
desidia of: 228
friend of Melior: 242
Statius on death of *puer*: 304–05
Floralia: see games
Florus: 306–07; 330–31
Forum Cornelii: see Gallia Cisalpina
Forum Transitorium: 353–54; 441–42, n.3
freedmen (see also slaves; servile birth)
ambiguous status of: 21; 346–48
as brokers: 21–22; 67; 193–94; 342–48; 364
Frère, Henri: 443
Friedländer, Ludwig: 40–41; 47; 441
friendship
and patronage: 14–18; 23
Cicero and Seneca on: 23
emotional and instrumental: 23
in *propempticon*: 237–38
Frontinus
as patron of Martial: 55–56; 68, n.98; 75
identity: 55–56
Fronto (in Martial): 76, n.136
funerary poetry: see *epicedion*; epigrams; rhetoric
Fuscus: 64; 74, n.124

Gallus (friend of Vitorius Marcellus): 237
Gallus (in Martial): 83, n.65
games:
Alban:
date and programme: 329
meaning for Domitian: 333–34
Statius at: 195–96; 203; 218; 359
themes in poetry contest: 329–30
Augustalia: 199, 203
Capitoline:
date: 197, n.12
Florus at: 330–31; 334–35
meaning for Domitian: 333–34
participants: 203; 333
programme: 328–29
Statius at: 195–97; 203; 334–35
Sulpicius Maximus at: 332–35
themes in poetry contest: 330–33
emperor and people at: 396
Floralia: 168
for Dacian victory: 211–12
for Sarmatian victory: 212
in Greece: 199; 334
munera: see amphitheatre
Neronia: 328; 334
Saecular: 211; 432; 434
Ganymede: 400; 427–29
Garthwaite, John: 11; 421; 427–36
genethliacon (see also birthdays;): 269–72
gentlemen of leisure:
in Martial: 67–70
in Statius: 222–29
gifts (see also patronage; *sportula*):
as rewards for writing: 80–87
at birthdays: 105–107; 254–55
at Saturnalia: 78–80; 186–87; 399
books as: 79–80; 107–18; 186–87
money: 81–82

poems as: 105–07; 254–55
symbolic vs. material value: 79–80
Glaucias (*puer* of Melior): 227; 260–61; 304–05; 314
Golden Age: 390; 399–400; 434
gossip: 296–97; 307–08; 429; 433–35
gratia: 25; 193–94

Hadrian: 1–10; 347; 427–28
Hardie, Alex: 8–10; 11; 274–77; 352
Helvidius the Younger: 384; 416
Hercules:
and Domitian: 320–21; 373
and *quies*: 320–23
epitrapezios: 321
Hercules Musarum, temple of: 8–9
Herennius Senecio: 151; 384
Hermogenes (historian): 416
Highet, Gilbert: 7–10
Holzberg, Niklas: 11
Horace (see also Martial; Statius)
and Maecenas: 2; 6–7, n.20; 85
dedication in: 129
on *scurrae*: 178–79
publication of *Odes*: 285; 288
Hosidius Geta, C.: 215–16

immortality: see fame
imperial cult: 380–83
improvisation:
and rapid composition: 251–52
at Capitoline games: 332
at *cena*: 99–100; 103–04
Quintilian on: 99; 252
Statius on: 248–51
Tacitus on: 251
variety of metres: 104
imputare: 241–42
indirect direction: 354
indulgentia of the emperor: 3
information gaps: 39–42; 115; 403
inheritance hunting: 42; 81
initiative: see patronage
Instanius Rufus:
as patron of Martial: 64; 74; 80
host at cena: 47; 101–02
name: 41, n.13
ioci: 110; 167–69
isolated vocative: 45–47

Janus: 353–54
joking (see also *cena*; *ioci*; Saturnalia):
ancient theory of: 176–77
as sign of intimacy: 74; 238
with patrons: 61; 155–59; 163; 165–66
Julia (niece of Domitian): 433–36
Julius Callistus: 343; 347
Julius Cerealis: 59
Julius Frontinus: see Frontinus
Julius Martialis:
and Martial: 72–73; 74, n.124
as dedicatee of Martial: 117; 125
Julius Menecrates:
as patron of Statius: 221–22; 238; 246
expectations for children advertised: 221–22; 301
Julius Phaon (?) (*a rationibus*):
career: 230–33
exile: 231–33; 303–04; 381
marital connections: 231–33
name: 230
Statius' apologetic strategy: 303–04
Julius Polybius: 342–43; 347
Julius Proculus: 101; 104–05, n.53
Julius Vestinus: see Vestinus
Junius Blaesus: see Blaesus
Jupiter: see Domitian; games – Capitoline
Juvenal:
friend of Martial: 5; 78
on client life: 13–15
on flattery: 419–21
on *lex Julia*: 433–34
on patronage of poets: 1–10
on recitation: 98
on Statius: 3–4
use of Martial's epigrams: 5–6; 15; 434, n.180
use of the past: 1–2, 44
vocabulary of commerce: 17
vocabulary of friendship: 17
vocabulary of prostitution: 3, n.9

Kalendae Decembres: see amphitheatre

Lappius Maximus: 66, n.90
Laus Pisonis, date: 83, n.161
lawyers: 65; 72–73
lector: see reader; readers

lex (νόμος)
at Saturnalia: 172–73
at symposia: 99; 172–73
lex Iulia de adulteriis coercendis:
as symbolic discourse: 432
motivates marriage of Stella and Violentilla: 298–99
re-introduction criticised by Martial?: 430–435
lex Roscia: 372; 431
lex Tappula: 172
libelli:
in Statius: 280; 341
requests to emperor: 339–43
unpublished collections? (see also presentation poems): 107–20; 365–74
libraries (public): 9; 116; 134–35
Licinianus: 83, n.65
Licinius Sura: 62
lions: 403–04; 408–10
listening: see reading; recitations
literacy: 136
Lucan:
author of *Siluae*: 253
and patronage: 3
as patron of Martial: 87
birthday celebrated by Argentaria Polla: 89; 225
Lucian:
on the Saturnalia: 184–89
on the symposium: 175
Lucius (in Martial): 83, n.65
Lucretius: 128; 320
ludi: see games
Lupus (in Martial):
identity: 60–61
in isolated vocative: 46

Macer: 83, n.65; 87
Maecenas: 2: 6–7, n.20; 69; 82–85
Maecius Celer:
as patron of Statius: 213; 237; 244
Statius on: 292–93
Manilius Vopiscus
as patron of Statius: 226; 239
Epicureanism: 316–17; 320
life: 226
poetry: 226; 320
quies: 309; 316–17
Marcella (patroness of Martial): 70; 80
Marcellinus: 66; 74, n.124; 165
Marsus: see Domitius Marsus
Martial (see also under the addressees):
addressees:
fictional: 42–45; 179; 183–84; 188–89
fictional, with real "I": 49–50
in "isolated vocative": 45–47
of equal status: 70–73
partially named: 41–42
unnamed: 40
and earlier poets:
Catullus: 64; 85; 109–10; 135
Horace: 60
Laus Pisonis: 83, n.161
Lucillius: 101
Marsus: 84–85; 135
Ovid: 60, n.66; 135
Virgil: 83–85; 135; 434
and Juvenal: 5; 78
and Paris: 4–5
and Statius: 88–89; 246–47
at *cenae*: 96–105; 177–79
Book 3 published from Gallia Cisalpina: 117; 377; 388, n.34
Book 12 published from Spain: 89; 115–16; 131
client duties performed by: 55–58
cycles:
and unpublished collections: 368–74
in Books 7–9: 372–73
on fictional addressees: 371
on lions and hares: 368–70; 379; 408–12
on locks of Earinus: 371
on *lex Julia*: 372; 430–36
on *lex Roscia*: 372; 431
domiciles:
in Forum Cornelii: 377
in Nomentum: 51, n.39, 52
in Rome: 50, 52
in Bilbilis: 52; 80
not in Tibur: 51
equestrian rank: 4–5, 53–55
"I":
fictional and real: 48–53
in jokes: 50–51
real, with fictional addressee: 49
increase in imperial panegyric: 384–87

ius trium liberorum: 53; 336–337
married or not: 50–51
material circumstances: 51–58
obscenity in: 349–50; 376–78; 386; 432
on adultery: 430–33; 437–38
on client life: 13–15, 55–58
on exchange: 78–82
on exchange with Domitian: 337–40
on giving fame: 142–43
on Maecenas: 6–7, n.20; 69; 82–85
on names, real and fictional: 43–45
on patronage of poets: 6–7
on publication: 92–93
on return to Spain: 55–57; 85
on Seneca and Piso: 86–87
on success as a poet: 54; 93; 96; 132–33; 138
pauper: 54
poetics: 44; 83–85; 167–69; 182–84; 433
posthumous additions to Book 12: 116, n.86; 438, n.195
recitation: 95–105; 363–64
revokes flattery of Domitian: 382–83; 437
slaves: 52–53
Spectacula: 91; 366–67; 405–08
tribunate: 4–5, 53; 337
uses own names in poems: 49
Xenia and Apophoreta: 91; 134; 186; 188; 366–67; 376; 385
Maternus (in Cassius Dio): 416
Maternus (in Martial): 65; 74, n.124
Maternus (in Tacitus): 145; 416, n.121
Maximus (in Martial): 66, n.92
Melior: see Atedius Melior
Menander Rhetor: see rhetoric
meus (see also *noster*): 74; 76; 238
mime: 30; 168–69
mimetic technique:
and fictional deixis: 260–69
definition: 261
in Catullus: 265–66
in Statius: 260–69
temporal contraction: 261; 265–66
Minerva (see also Domitian; games – Alban): 60, n.65; 158, n.45
Minicius Faustinus: 68
mittere (of books): 122–24
Mummia Nigrina: 70
Munatius Gallus: 83, n.65
munera: see amphitheatre

names, real and fictional: 43–47
Naples (see also Campania):
Augustalia: 199, 203
Julius Menecrates at: 221–22
Pollius Felix at: 222
Silius Italicus at: 149
Silv. 4 published from: 204
Statius at: 195; 199–200; 203–04; 316; 361; 389
Violentilla from: 211; 236
nature, subjugation of: 319–20; 389–91
naumachies: 379; 406
negotiation:
patronage as: 28; 350; 354; 378; 385–87
imperial cult as: 382
Nepos (biographer): 310
Nepos (in Martial): 59
Nero: 148–51; 328; 334; 382; 414–15; 440, n.200
Nerva:
in Martial
as emperor: 117–18; 437–40
as *priuatus*: 64; 437
quies of: 64; 85, n.166; 308
nidus: 157–58, n.43
Nomentum:
residence of Martial: 51, n.39; 52, 56, 58–59, 79; 87
residence of Nepos: 59
residence of Q. Ovidius: 71
Norbanus:
as patron of Martial: 66; 74, n.124; 76–78
identity: 66
noster (see also *meus*): 74; 76; 239–40
Novius Vindex:
as patron of Martial: 68; 76; 89
as patron of Statius: 76; 89; 228–29; 240
friend of Vitorius Marcellus: 243
lifestyle: 228–29; 322
statuette of Hercules:
described at dinner: 102–03; 256–57
interpreted by Statius: 321–23

occasions, occasional poetry: 33; 39, n.5; 91–93; 164–65; 367–68
officia: 23–25
Optatus (friend of Crispinus): 217
opusculum: 287
otium (see also *quies*): 148–49; 308; 315–16
Ovid (see also Martial; Statius)
  exiled: 135; 381; 409
  on public libraries: 135
  on Saturnalian literature: 172
  publication of *Pont.*: 285; 288
Ovidius, Q.: 71; 74, n.124; 104

palace on Palatine: see Domus Flavia
Papinius: see Statius
Paris (pantomime dancer): 3–5; 21
Parthenius (*a cubiculo*):
  broker for Martial: 67; 345–46; 386; 438
  dedicatee of Mart. 11: 117; 438
  gives Martial toga: 54; 80
  Martial on birthday of son: 165
"patron", meanings of the word:
  supporter of writer: 12
  equivalent of *patronus*: 12–18
  sociological term: 18–26
patronage (general):
  and friendship: 14–18; 23
  as system: 26
  asymmetry: 20–22; 25–26
  attitudes towards: 20
  brokerage (see also freedmen): 22; 67: 193–94
  community patronage (see also evergetism): 327–29; 388–89
  definitions: 18–19
  distinguished from employment: 22–23; 29
  duration: 22–23; 61; 74
  in the Early Republic: 13
  in the Late Republic and Early Empire: 13–14
  informality: 20
  initiative: 28–29
  personal character: 22–23
  reciprocity: 23–25
  vocabulary of book-keeping: 24–25; 241–43
  voluntariness: 19
patronage (literary):
  as patronage in sociological sense: 27–32; 291–93
  asymmetry: 27–28
  community patronage: 328–35
  definition: 26
  duration: 29–31
  in Greece: 8; 30
  in the Middle Ages: 30
  initiative: 28–29
    patron's, disguised: 88; 245–47
  literary identity of patrons: 291–94
  reciprocity: 29–31
  services rendered by patrons:
    brokerage: 67; 193–94; 341–48
    correction: 125–28
    help with publication: 221; 282–83; 367–68
    help with recitation: 9; 95
    hospitality: 4; 55–56; 103; 115; 154; 162; 177; 238–39; 247; 257; 364; 392–95
    literary advice: 214; 221;
    material support: 78–87; 240–44
    protection against criticism: 112; 117; 161; 214; 283–84; 288
patronus:
  as former owner of freedman: 14; 19–20
  avoided in personal patronage: 14
  counterpart of *cliens*: 12–13
Paulus (in Martial): 65; 74, n.124
pauper: 54; 187; 203
payment for poets:
  in Greece: 8
  not in Rome: 7–9
  only for theatrical works: 3; 29–30
Pedanius Fuscus Salinator: see Fuscus
Phaedrus: 19
Phaon: see Julius Phaon (?)
Philetas (*puer* of Flavius Ursus): 304–05
Piso: see Calpurnius Piso
plagiarism: 96, n.15
Pliny:
  as orator: 145; 153
  career under Domitian: 384
  Cicero as example for: 145–46
  dedication of *Ep.*: 129
  friend of Senecio et al.: 151; 384
  in Martial: 78; 145

on dinner entertainments: 97
on his epigrams: 96; 132; 147; 156–57
on fame through *studia*: 142–48
on imperial *cenae*: 395–96
on imperial cult: 382–83
on imperial freedmen: 347–48
on liberty of speech: 440
on money gifts: 81
on names, real and fictional: 43
on *otium*: 325
on patronage of Martial: 37–39; 48; 81; 142–43; 147–48
on praising emperors: 412–13
on readers: 137
on reciprocity: 23–25
on recitation: 95–96; 140
on Regulus: 151–54
on Silius Italicus: 40; 63; 148–50
on Stella's *Columba*: 157–58
on year 93: 384
publication of *Pan.*: 124
requests for correction: 124
Plotius Grypus:
as patron of Statius: 205; 217–18; 238
career: 217–18
Plutarch:
on behaviour at dinner: 172
on entertainment at dinner: 97–98
on Epicureanism and poetry: 320
on mockery at dinner: 98
Polla: see Argentaria Polla
Pollius Felix
as patron of Statius: 222–23; 238–39
Epicureanism: 222–25; 318–21
former career: 222; 317–18
poetry: 223; 320
quies: 222–23; 317–21
temple for Hercules: 320–21
villa as symbol: 318–20
wife: see Argentaria Polla
Polybius: see Julius Polybius
Pompeius Auctus: 65; 138–39
portraits: 104
Potitus: 56
power: 20–21
praise as ridicule or criticism (see also Domitian; *figura*; flattery): 413–16; 420–21
prefaces: 113–17; 193; 281–84
presentation poems (and letters):
distribution over books: 113
for emperor: 108; 365–66
for non-imperial addressees: 108–113
included in book: 113; 122–23
primipili, *primipilares*: see centurions
Priscilla (see also Abascantus):
funeral monument: 302
patron of Statius' wife: 193–94
relation with court: 233–34
propempticon:
friendship in: 237
mimetic technique in: 267–68
terminology: 269–72
protégés and clients: 25–26
publication (see also readership):
advance copies: 130–31
and dedication: 122–28; 131
of epigram books: 91
terminology: 121–24; 157–58
through booksellers: 121–22; 130
through *amici*: 122–26; 130–31; 282–84
through emperor: 367–68
Publius (in Martial): 69
Pudens, A.: 71–72; 74, n.124; 133
Puelma, Mario: 11
pueri (*delicati*): 304–05; 427–28
Puteoli: 222–23; 317–18; 359–60; 388

quies (see also *otium*):
and Epicureanism: 316–21
and *uirtus*: 316; 321
attitudes towards: 308; 315–16
in Statius: 309–23
of Nerva: 64; 85, n.166; 308
Quintilian:
dedication of *Inst.*: 128; 129, n.125
in Juvenal: 4
on encomium: 275
on *emphasis* and *figura*: 416–18
on humour and mockery: 177–78
on improvisation: 99; 252
on the good orator: 153
publication of *Inst.*: 122, n.103

rank: 21

reader (addressed by Martial): 114–17; 120; 136
readers (*lectores*, ἀναγνῶσται): 137
readership:
of Martial: 85; 131–32; 141
of Statius: 289
reading:
auditory and visual vocabulary used for: 137–38
rituals of: 140–41
social vs. solitary: 137–41
reception: 32–33
reciprocity: see *amicitia*; patronage
recitations of poetry:
at *cenae*: 97–105
by Martial: 95–105
by Pliny: 95–96
by Silius Italicus: 63
by Statius:
epics: 3, 203
Silvae: 256–79; 356–63
in the Athenaeum: 7
in the Aedes Herculis Musarum: 7
in patrons' houses: 9; 95; 211
informal: 96; 138
of epigrams: 95
vs. publication: 96
recusatio: 85, n.166; 300, n.29
Regulus:
as patron of Martial: 62–63; 74; 78–79; 92
Martial as companion of: 154
Martial jokes with: 155
Martial on, compared with Pliny on: 151–54
Martial on exchange with: 154–55
Remmius Palaemon: 4; 99, n.30
Restitutus: 65, n.84; 105–107
resources:
and power: 21
first- and second-order: 22
rex, regina:
at banquets and Saturnalia: 170–72
patron: 16–17; 87; 205
rhetoric:
and γραμματική: 269–72
influence on the *Silvae*: 272–77
use of poetic examples: 273
Rome: see under individual monuments
Roscius Aelianus Maecius Celer: 80; 213
Rufus:
gives books to Venuleius: 111–12
identity: 41–43, 47
in isolated vocative: 45–46
rumours: see gossip
Rutilius Gallicus:
as patron of Statius: 210–11; 236; 244
career: 206–10
poetry: 210–11

Sabina (from Ateste): 70, n.109; 130
Saleius Bassus: 3
Saller, Richard P.: 11; 18–26; 327
salutatio: 13; 15–16; 57; 340
Saturnalia:
and *cena*: 166–173
and Domitian: 167
and Golden Age: 399–400
and *Kalendae Decembres*: 398–402
and Nerva:437–38
as carnival: 180–81
as context for gift-giving: 78–80; 110–11; 152; 186–87; 399
as context for *ioci*: 110; 167
as context for patronage: 184–89; 205; 240–41
as context for publication of epigrams: 110–11; 118–19; 126–27; 130, n.28; 166–67
"kings" at: 170–72
"laws" at: 172–73; 184–87
poetry at, and on: 186–87; 205
Saturninus: see Antonius Saturninus
schema: see *figura*
school-teaching: 8, 200–01
Scott, James C.: 437
scurra, scurrilis: 178–79
Secundus: 78, n.139
senatorial addressees:
in Martial: 62–66
in Statius: 206–218; 226
Seneca:
and Polybius: 340–41
on imperial freedmen: 347
on lions: 409
on murder of Agrippina: 436
on *otium*: 316

on reciprocity: 23–25
patron of Martial: 86–87
Sentius Augurinus: 95; 147
Septimius Severus (emperor): 219–20
Septimius Severus (patron of Statius):
as patron of Statius: 218–20; 238
friend of Vitorius Marcellus: 219
grandfather of emperor: 219–20
literary interests: 218–19
Punic background: 306–07
quies: 218–20
Septimontium: 401
serio-comical: 181–84
servile birth, Statius on: 303; 305
Severus:
dedicatee of Mart. 5: 127–28
identity: 41; 83, n.65
in isolated vocative: 46
non-existing: 80, n.148; 82, n.157
Sextus (*a bibliothecis*): 67; 134–35; 327, n.2; 343–44; 386
Sidonius Apollinaris: 254; 289
Silius Decianus: 130, n.128; 150
Silius Italicus:
as patron of Martial: 40; 63–64; 74
Martial on, and Pliny on: 148–50
on Punics: 306
otium of: 148–49
receives Mart. 4: 110–11
Silius Severus: 41; 150
Serranus: 3
sincerity (see also flattery; praise): 412–15; 419–21; 436
slaves (see also freedmen; servile birth):
desired by Martial: 84–85
owned by Martial: 48; 52–53
praised: 40, n.8; 47; 66, n.91
role in book-production: 130
sodalis: see *amicitia* – vocabulary of
soteria: 104–05, n.53; 269–71; 274; 276
speech acts in poetry (see also communication):
motivated: 30–31; 42; 46; 235; 404
performed and represented: 48
sphragis: 118, n.91; 195; 287
sportula:
gift to clients: 13, 16
received by senators and knights: 56–57
symbolic vs. material value: 56–57
when distributed: 57, n.55
Statius (see also under the individual addressees):
Achilleid: 203–04; 214; 221; 287
and earlier poets:
Catullus: 188, n.137; 205; 257; 278
Homer: 359
Horace: 218; 220; 237; 274; 278; 424
Ovid: 257; 264; 274; 278, n.77; 424
Stella: 257, n.19
Virgil: 359; 390–91
and Martial: 88–89; 246–47
and Paris: 3–4; 202
as a Greek: 203; 334
at Alban Games: 195–96; 203; 218; 359
at Capitoline Games: 195–97; 203; 334–35
date of birth: 199–200, n.24
date of death: 203–04
De Bello Germanico: 330
estate at Alba Longa: 202
material circumstances: 4; 202–03
on return to Naples: 195; 204
pauper: 203
puns on proper names: 224, n.112; 230, n.134
Silvae:
and rhetoric: 269–77
apologetic strategy in: 307
as epigrams: 257
Book 5 posthumous: 193
criticised: 250; 283–84; 286; 375
different character of Book 4: 277–79; 287
epistolary: 277–78
immortality expected for: 254–55; 288
meaning of title: 252–54
occasional character of: 285; 289
offered to emperor: 374–76
order of poems in: 287; 375–76
poems as gifts: 254–55; 279–80
poems not included in: 285
prefaces: 281–84
publication: 248–56; 279–90
publication of 1–3: 285–89

(Statius – *Silvae*)
rapid composition: 250–52
recitation?: 256–79; 356–63
titles of poems: 269–72
Thebaid:
date: 196–97
publication: 221; 282
recitation: 3; 203
Statius the Elder:
and Flavian emperors: 201–02
as poet and teacher: 199–202
mourned by Statius (date): 195–98
name: 199
rank: 198–99
status: 20–21
Stella (see also Violentilla):
and lions-hares-cycle: 368–70
as patron of Martial: 58; 61; 74, n.124; 78–80; 87–90
as patron of Statius: 88; 211–12; 236–37; 244
career:
praised (and not) by Martial: 156
praised by Statius: 211–12; 300–01
Columba:
compared with Catullus' *Passer*: 156–58; 297–98
elegiac topoi in: 300
title and character: 156–57, n.40
host for:
improvisations: 87–88; 100; 159
recitations: 95; 211
lifestyle: 158–59
marriage to Violentilla:
defended by Statius: 296–301
joked at by Martial: 156; 297; 299–300
necessitated by *lex Julia*: 298–99
Martial jokes with: 155–59
Martial praises: 156–58
Martial sends Book 12 to: 116; 135
Stertinius Avitus: 41; 83, n.65; 114–15
Stoicism: 303; 320–21
studia: 1. n.2; 144–48; 342
Suetonius:
as *a studiis*: 344
on year 89: 384–85
praised by Pliny: 147
Sulpicius Maximus: 332–33
symposium: see *cena*
sympotic poetry:
in Martial: 100–04
in Statius: 256–58; 358–59

Tacitus:
on fame for speeches: 145
on improvisation: 251
on liberty of speech: 440
on luxury and sobriety: 158
on year 93: 384
Templum Gentis Flaviae: 302; 377; 393, nn.50–51
Templum Novum: 116
Terentius Priscus:
as patron of Martial: 69; 74; 81; 88–89
compared with Maecenas: 69; 85
dedicatee of Mart. 12: 115–16; 125–26
identity: 69
Tettius Julianus: 232–33
Titinius Capito: 226, n.120; 302
title(s):
of books: 140
of poems in the *Silvae*: 269–72
Silvae: 252–54
"*Spectacula*": 405
Titus:
gives Martial *ius III liberorum*: 336
receives *Sp.*: 366–68; 405–08
pupil of Statius father?: 201
Toranius: 114–15
tradere (of poems and books): 279–80; 341; 361–63
Trajan:
in Florus: 331
in Martial: 118; 377; 382–83; 440
in Pliny: 382–83; 395–96; 412–13; 440
Trimalchio (in Petronius): 99
triumph
as context for *ioci*: 168–69
as theme in poetry: 330–31; 359; 372–73; 386; 388–91
Tryphon: 122
tyrants, tyranny:
in declamation: 416–18
topoi in depiction of: 395–96; 413–134; 435

Varius: 2; 6–7, n.20; 30, n.93; 84–85

Velius: 65, n.87
Venuleius: 75; 111–12
Vergilius Romanus: 43
Verginius Rufus: 143–44
Vespasian: 3
Vestinus: 76; 229; 322
Vestricius Spurinna: 124; 146
Vettius Bolanus: 216
Veyne, Paul: 328
Via Domitiana: 359–61; 388–91
Vibius Maximus (patron of Martial): 66; 119–20
Vibius Maximus (patron of Statius):
  as patron of Statius: 220–21; 238; 246
  identity: 220
villas, poems on: 73; 152, n.30; 161–62; 316–21; 346, n.77; 392
Violentilla (see also Stella)
  in Stella's poetry: 297, 300
  marries Stella: 297–99
  pre-marital relations with Stella: 295–98
Virgil (see also Martial; Statius)
  allegorical interpretation of: 83–84
  and Maecenas: 2; 6–7, n.20; 83–85
  birthday celebrated: 40; 150; 165
Vitorius Hosidius Geta: 214–16
Vitorius Marcellus:
  as patron of Statius: 213–16; 243
  career: 213–14
  dedicatee of Quint. *Inst.*: 128; 213, n.70; 214
  dedicatee of *Silv.* 4: 283–84
  expectations for son advertised: 214–16; 301
  literary advice: 214
Voconius Victor: 69–70

wealth:
  and rank, status, power: 21; 28; 54–55
  praised: 63; 70; 102; 158–59; 218–34; 309–12

White, Peter: 11–12, 14, 32; 108–23
women:
  as addressees in Martial: 70
  as readers: 136

Zetzel, James E.G.: 27